

Fall 12-2012

Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Student Behavior and Academic Success in Schools

John Scott Rimes
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rimes, John Scott, "Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Student Behavior and Academic Success in Schools" (2012). *Dissertations*. 396.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/396>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF IN-SCHOOL
SUSPENSION PROGRAMS ON CHANGING STUDENT
BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMIC SUCCESS IN SCHOOLS

by

John Scott Rimes

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2012

ABSTRACT

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF IN-SCHOOL
SUSPENSION PROGRAMS ON CHANGING STUDENT
BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMIC SUCCESS IN SCHOOLS

by John Scott Rimes

December 2012

This study was performed to examine the perception of teachers, in-school suspension (ISS) staff, and administrators on the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and academic success at various schools with different performance levels according the current Mississippi Accountability Model. The 32 schools included in this study were located in the central region of Mississippi. The survey was administered during the spring semester of 2012. Data from the ISS survey determined that there was no relationship between the school performance level and the perceptions of ISS.

Overall, the researcher found that there was no evidence supporting the idea that ISS programs are more effective in schools that have attained higher performance level ratings. Respondents in general perceived that ISS to be ineffective in their school setting. The performance level groups disagreed on a specific purpose for the ISS programs, but they agreed that the programs should be more punitive in nature. The researcher found that there was the perception that if students in ISS are to be successful, there should be more academic assistance and counseling inside ISS programs. The

performance level groups differed in their opinions of their own schools' ISS staffs' qualifications. They did agree that qualified personnel such as a certified teacher should be in charge of ISS. Finally, there was a significant difference in the performance level group's opinions of how well the staffs communicated with each other about ISS. All the performance level groups agreed that teachers were rarely informed about student improvement in ISS.

The results obtained from this study will inform professionals of steps that can be taken to improve any ISS program. The researcher suggests actions that should be taken to define the purpose, along with the policies and procedures that go along with an effective program. The researcher suggests that there should be particular attention given to teacher behaviors toward ISS and a focus on a more collegial relationship between the classroom and ISS teachers. This would, in the researcher's opinion, improve communication among the entire staff. There should also be support from the administration and constant monitoring of the program. With the differences discovered inside the different performance level schools, the researcher recommends that each school design its ISS program around its individual needs.

COPYRIGHT BY
JOHN SCOTT RIMES

2012

The University of Southern Mississippi

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF IN-SCHOOL
SUSPENSION PROGRAMS ON CHANGING STUDENT
BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMIC SUCCESS IN SCHOOLS

by

John Scott Rimes

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Dr. David Lee

Director

Dr. J. T. Johnson

Dr. Rose McNeese

Dr. Thelma Roberson

Dr. Susan A. Siltanen

Dean of the Graduate School

December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In undertaking the pursuit of an advanced degree while working full time, being a husband, father, and championship coach, it is necessary to have the support and encouragement of many people. This document is meant to honor those who have aided me in this process. I would not have been able to accomplish this monstrous task without the love, support, and understanding of my wonderful wife, Debbie. She is an amazing wife, mother, and friend. I want to thank her for allowing me to reach my goals and never doubting my pathway. My children, Jordan, Allyson, and Carson, are without question the very best children any man could ask for. I encourage them to always believe in their dreams and stay focused in their life endeavors.

During my career in education and coaching, I have continued to attend school and have earned a master's, specialist, and now a doctoral degree. During those years I have also managed to lead successful baseball teams and win championships, the latest being this 2012 season, my 12th and final season as a head high school baseball coach, winning my 8th Regional Championship, and earning my 212th career win.

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Rose McNeese, Dr. Thelma Roberson, and Dr. Ronald Styron. I especially want to thank Dr. J. T. Johnson and Dr. David Lee for their leadership and patience. The completion of this piece of work supports my motto, "Winning is my business and business is good." I thank my mom, dad, brothers, and sister. Being the youngest in the family, I was molded by you and took on many of your characteristics. You are all winners, and I thank you all for helping me reach my goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Research Questions	
Definition of Terms	
Delimitations	
Assumptions	
Justification	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	13
Overview	
Theoretical Framework	
Discipline and Violence in Schools	
Laws and Regulations	
Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions	
Corporal Punishment	
Rationale for In-School Suspension	
Characteristics of Effective In-School Suspension Programs	
In-School Suspension Models	
Goals of In-School-Suspension Programs	
Effectiveness of In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions	
Student Academic Achievement	
School-Wide Discipline Strategies	
Student Behavior	
The Principal's Role	
The Teacher's Role	
Impact of School Culture and Climate	
Summary	

III.	METHODOLOGY.....	65
	Introduction	
	Research Design	
	Participants	
	Instrumentation	
	Procedures	
	Data Analysis	
	Limitations	
	Summary	
IV.	FINDINGS.....	72
	Introduction	
	Sample Characteristics	
	Item Descriptives	
	Statistical Data	
	Summary	
V.	DISCUSSION.....	85
	Introduction	
	Conclusion and Discussion	
	Limitations	
	Recommendations for Policy or Practice	
	Recommendations for Future Research	
	APPENDIXES.....	96
	REFERENCES.....	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	School Results of the 2010 Mississippi Accountability Model.....	66
2.	Roles in School, Gender, and Years of Experience.....	73
3.	Schools' Performance Level and Title Status.....	75
4.	Teacher, Administrator, ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Program Effectiveness (All Performance Levels).....	76
5.	Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Program Purpose (All Performance Levels).....	76
6.	Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Staff Qualifications (All Performance Levels).....	77
7.	Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Staff and Classroom Teacher Communication (All Performance Levels).....	77
8.	Relationship Between Performance Groups for Perception of In-School Suspension.....	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is not difficult to find evidence of violence in America. Constantly in the news, there are many acts of violence occurring daily across the nation. The public school system is not immune to these violent acts. Episodes including school shootings, bullying, or frequent student fights are occurrences that must be planned for. According to Marzano (2003) in his book *What Works in Schools: Translating Research Into Action*, if teachers and students do not feel safe they will not have the necessary psychological energy for teaching and learning. In an early 1990 national survey of teachers performed by Mansfield, Alexander, and Farris (1991), 19% of teachers reported verbal abuse by a student in their school during the year-long survey period. There were 8% reporting having been threatened with injury within the year, while 2% reported actually having been physically attacked within the year. Moving forward not much has changed. According to Robers, Zhang, and Truman (2010), during the 2007–08 school year 8% of secondary teachers reported being threatened with injury by a student. It was also reported that 4% of teachers reported being physically attacked by a student from their school. In 2009, 31% of students in secondary grades reported they had been in a physical fight at least one time during the previous 12 months, with 11% saying that they had been in a fight at school (Robers et al., 2010).

Discipline issues and violence in schools continue to present tough challenges and bring to the surface crucial issues facing school systems at this time. According to the Mississippi Youth Justice Project (2010), Mississippi loses one third of its new teachers within the first three years, with the majority leaving because of discipline issues

rather than over pay concerns. Student discipline is a nationwide issue. According to the article *U.S. cited as world's most violent industrial nation -- pervasive fear is part of life, researchers say* (1992), a study conducted by the National Research Council Committee on Law and Justice determined that the United States has become the most violent nation in the industrialized world. Criminal violence has become a trait of American life ("U.S. cited as", 1992).

Schools and communities should look to do what is best for the child. There is already an expectation that schools not only serve to educate students, but are also expected to help students develop into productive members of society. According to Wilson (2004), schools must help children develop academically, rationally, emotionally, and behaviorally, while at the same time providing environments that all stakeholders deem as safe. Bulach (2002) agreed that schools are expected to reach out to the students in his work on implementing character education. It is anticipated that schools provide settings that will curb violence and enable students to practice behaviors that are civil as well as moral in nature (Bulach, 2002).

Harvey and Moosha (1977) wrote how it is decided upon by researchers that suspending students out of school and depriving them of all or part of the instructional program is not seen as acting in the students' best interest. Lee (2007), in research on changing student's behavior through ISS, agreed that it has become more important for students to be in school due to the current educational process, accountability models, and grade level testing. The adoption of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 led school administrators to consider the schools' average daily attendance and other accreditation issues that were impacted when dispensing discipline to students (Lee,

2007). For many years, school administrators have used out-of-school suspension (OSS) as a disciplinary action. Vavrus and Cole (2002) suggested that suspension plays a prominent role in the discourse of school violence since it serves as a separation period for the disruptive student. It was also reported that many times there is no single event that precipitates a suspension. Research has shown that suspensions do not necessarily come about because of a student's violent behavior, but frequently occur as a result of a violation of a particular code of classroom conduct (Vavrus & Cole, 2002). According to Skiba, Peterson, and Williams (1997), there are also indications that suspension is used disproportionately with students who are: (a) male, (b) from low socioeconomic families, (c) of a minority ethnic background, and (d) identified as having a disability or low academic competence.

According to a survey of policies and procedures dealing with school suspension performed by Costenbader and Markson (1994), data from 10 states indicated that 42% of suspensions involved students who had been previously suspended one or more times. This research tends to foster the belief that teachers are using the techniques of suspension as a tool for classroom management. Papash (2001), on the subject of classroom management, tended to agree that using suspensions for minor offenses might excuse teachers from developing constructive strategies to resolve conflicts in the classroom. Lock (1991), in work on preventing classroom discipline problems, suggested that schools should be established for children, not the adults, while noting that discipline should not be made to make life easier for adults, but to educate children to be more responsible and to become self-disciplined.

According to Richardson's (2009) action research, parents have become more concerned about the negative behaviors arising by placing students in out-of-school suspension. Parents complain that students are basically on vacation when they are suspended from school and that they are prone to participate in negative behaviors (Richardson, 2009). Spivak (1999) also suggested that without a parent at home during the day, students who have been suspended out of school or expelled from school are far more likely to commit crimes. There seems to be a clear relationship between disciplinary exclusion such as suspensions and expulsions and poor outcomes such as delinquency, academic failure, and dropouts (Spivak, 1999). Sacharow (2010) also found in research on suspensions of students that those who are suspended do no schoolwork and are not interacting with their teachers or other students.

Cotton and Savard (1982) reported that research shows that the simple detention and suspension of students does not necessarily produce positive results. On the other hand, special facilities that temporarily confine students and provide counseling and other assistance have been shown to be effective in producing improvements in behavior and learning motivation (Cotton & Savard, 1982).

Statement of the Problem

Adams (2000) reported on discipline and school violence that the suspension of a student is believed to be one of the most serious penalties a school can impose in response to disruptive behavior. The use of suspension by school administrators, according to Taras (2003) in a report by the American Academy of Pediatrics, serves the purpose of punishing students, alerting parents, and protecting other students and staff. Flanagan (2007) noted that suspensions were intended to be viewed as severe

punishment and to send a clear message to the student and the parent. This type of exclusion guaranteed getting a parent's attention and encouraging him or her to attend a school conference to discuss the problem behavior (Flanagain, 2007).

Hymowitz (2000) found that in earlier periods of time that there were several reasons that school administrators used disciplinary actions such as suspension and expulsion: a) exclusion was an efficient way to handle large numbers of disruptive youths; b) exclusion offered protection to the student body; and c) It aided the administrators in demonstrating a sense of control over the uncontrollable.

Research suggests that excluding students from school may expose them to a whole new set of problems. Hochman and Worner (1987) reported that an out-of-school suspension may hinder a student's achievement and negatively impact the student's ability to improve his or her problem-solving skills. Along the same lines, DeRidder (1991) found that a student who is consequently suspended for breaking a school rule is likely to be placed in the very same situation as the activity that got him or her punished in the first place.

There should be a process for keeping students in school. Wallace, Goodkind, Wallace, and Bachman (2008) found that suspensions and expulsions remove students from the learning environment with a potential of increasing their time unsupervised and increasing the students' chances of poor academic performance, grade retention, and substance abuse. Southard's (2002) ideas on in-school suspension tend to suggest that there may be a direct correlation between daytime juvenile crime rate and the number of out-of-school assignments levied by schools. Guindon (1992) found in his research that out-of-school suspension might be rewarding to students, as well as an inappropriate tool,

depending on the students' conduct. Alternatives to out-of-school suspension are preferred as long as they are punitive, educational, and rehabilitative. It is suggested that constant supervision aids in keeping students from mischievous behavior and that keeping students in school should be a priority for educators (Guindon, 1992).

Suspending a student out of school has been known to lead to more discipline problems for the student. Data gathered from a study by Brown (2007) found that students who were excluded from school witnessed a more unfavorable schooling experience such as prolonged absences and a prolonged or even permanent disconnection from school. This research suggested that absence from school can have a negative effect on the student's achievement (Brown, 2007).

Most research agrees that a tremendous advantage of in-school suspension is keeping the student in the educational environment while handing out discipline. However, Wheelock's (1986) work in Boston middle school systems suggests that in-school suspension represents a short-term solution to discipline problems but does not seek to correct specific conditions that lead to misbehavior. If a program is poorly designed and managed, there may not be an attempt to address the misbehavior that may add to the students' academic decline. Some in-school suspension programs may create additional problems for students (Wheelock, 1986).

Purpose of the Study

Teachers tirelessly work to create good instructional time during their classes. Test scores are more often being viewed publicly and used as a guide by the school districts and state departments to measure a school's success or failure. Teachers and administrators continuously work to provide a safe environment that will enhance

students' academic achievement. Discipline problems can take away from a safe classroom environment and the students' ability to learn. This can have an adverse effect on school test scores.

There are many who believe children should be kept in the classroom or at least in school unless they pose a threat. A Connecticut law was passed that limits the amount of time a student can be suspended out-of-school and increases the limits of in-school-suspension (Miners & Scarpa, 2007). This could be a trend that will be seen in many states in the future. Keeping students in school could help in many ways such as enhancing average daily attendance (ADA), improving academic achievement, and possibly lowering delinquent behavior in the community.

In observance of the current programs, this study was designed to examine the effectiveness of in-school suspension (ISS) programs in changing student behavior and promoting a students academic success. The purpose of this study was to examine the perception of the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and academic success at various schools with different performance labels as perceived by the faculty, ISS staff, and the administration.

Data were gathered using surveys from teachers, ISS staff, and administrators to better understand their perceptions toward their current in-school suspension programs. The policies and procedures that govern in-school suspension and the overall effects of the ISS programs were investigated. Once all of the information was collected, an evaluation of current practices and effectiveness of the in-school suspension program was made. With these data, the faculty, ISS staff, and administration will be able to make

positive changes to their ISS programs and work to improve the overall academic and behavioral goals of their schools.

A potential benefit of the study is the discovery of the correlation between a well-run in-school suspension program and the higher academic success of the school. The researcher wished to ascertain whether or not higher performing schools put more emphasis in their structure and goals of the in-school suspension programs. The schools and districts involved will benefit from the data produced from the results of the study.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study were:

1. Is there a difference in the way teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the effectiveness of the in-school suspension programs in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label?
2. Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive a difference in the desired purpose of the ISS program as being therapeutic, academic, or punitive in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label?
3. Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the ISS staff as qualified to properly manage the ISS program in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label?

4. Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive that there is proper communication between the teachers and the ISS staff in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label?

Definition of Terms

Academic achievement - Benchmark goals to help ensure that all children are proficient in their learning, accountability of students that is in place in schools (Advocates for Children and Youth, 2006).

Administrators - For the purpose of this study, this will include principals and assistant principals.

Classroom management - Skills needed by teachers that are necessary to deal with the youngster who talks back or the one who constantly interrupts a lecture or discussion (Sacharow, 2010).

Corporal punishment - Discipline strategy that involves students being struck (Teicher, 2005). This term refers to a violent discipline strategy, which is losing popularity, according to an article by Portner (1998).

Expulsions - The practice of excluding students from school for disciplinary reasons and removing students from the attendance rolls (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

In-school suspension - A discipline model where the student is removed from the classroom and required to stay in a specific area for a specific length of time in lieu of out-of-school suspension (Gootman, 1998).

In-school suspension staff/director/teacher - For the purpose of this study, this includes anyone working in the leadership or instructional capacity over the ISS program inside of a school.

Out-of-school suspension - Short-term exclusion of students from school for disciplinary purposes. This refers to a school suspension of 10 or fewer days (LaMorte, 2008).

School culture - The shared beliefs and attitudes that characterize the district-wide organization and establish boundaries for its constituent units (Tableman, 2004).

School climate - The collective personality of the school, based upon an atmosphere distinguished by the personal, social, and professional interactions of those individuals within the school (Deal & Peterson, 1990).

School-wide discipline strategies - The implementation of a violence awareness or prevention program in an effort to address school safety issues and to reduce and prevent violence on campus (Brugman, 2004).

Delimitations

This study investigated teacher, administrator, and ISS staff's perceptions of the in-school suspension (ISS) programs in a sample of schools across Mississippi with accreditation labels including Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the current Mississippi Accountability Label. These levels serve as an evaluative and improvement tool for both local districts and state use. Star is the highest achievable level and Failing represents the lowest level of achievement.

Assumptions

The researcher assumed that teachers, administrators, and ISS staff responded honestly to all questions and inquiries listed in the questionnaire. The researcher also assumes the Mississippi Department of Education correctly listed school's accreditation levels.

Justification

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and their academic success at various schools with different performance labels, as perceived by the schools' personnel including teachers, ISS staff, and administration. In the past, there has been a great deal of research done on in-school suspension and its effects on students' behavior and their achievement. Many of the past studies have been limited to individual schools or school districts. This study incorporates many schools and districts along with their different policies and procedures of administering the ISS program.

With testing, supervision issues, and funding, it is important to the communities, schools, and the school districts to keep students in the educational environment. This study will contribute to the educational field by providing fresh data that will institute change and improvements inside a program that is not always monitored or evaluated for its improvement of students' academic success or given credit for changing a students' poor behavior. This study will also provide a Mississippi perspective to a nationally used discipline program.

Summary

Discipline problems can take away from a safe classroom environment and the students' ability to learn. With current school requirements such as funding, testing, and providing a safe and orderly school environment, school personnel need an avenue of discipline that keeps the disruptive student in the educational arena. Effective ISS programs can aid schools in rendering discipline and helping students with instructional dilemmas while meeting other areas of concern.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

In the early formation of schools in America, Thomas Jefferson included in the *objects of primary education* qualities such as morals, duties to neighbors, knowledge of rights, intelligence, and faithfulness in social rights (Noddings, 2005). Nodding's article, *What Does It Mean to Educate the Whole Child?*, goes on to suggest that as years have passed there has been change in the way the responsibilities of the educational system are seen.

With the overall goal of the No Child Left Behind Act (2002), being to have all students achieving at proficient levels by the year 2014, states, school districts, and individual schools must take specific steps toward that goal. Hanson, Burton, and Quam (2006), in their article *Six Concepts to Help You Align with NCLB*, state that within the NCLB law, there are several key components that affect school districts. These components include the following: (a) all students in specific grade levels must be assessed to determine if they are achieving state determined levels of proficiency; (b) all school districts will be measured against the concept of adequate yearly progress (AYP); (c) AYP must be met not only as a whole school population, but also in the following subgroups; gender, racial/ethnic minority, disability, limited English proficient, low income, and migrant; and (d) all schools must have highly qualified teachers (Hanson et al., 2006). In the book *Breakthrough*, Fullan, Hill, and Crevola (2006) suggest that the new mission driven by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is to get all students to meet high standards of education and provide them with a lifelong education.

Students have a variety of encounters while growing up. Their personal life experiences are based on their social and economic status and their family upbringing. Sisco (2010) suggested that a student's behavior may be directly related to these types of personal and social matters. Because of this lacking in their socioeconomic status, many students do not have the opportunity to witness the modeling of positive social behaviors in their surroundings outside of the school environment (Sisco, 2010). She also added that the deficit in life experiences can lead to behavior problems, which in turn could negatively affect a student's educational experience.

Theoretical Framework

Moorefield (2005) stated that schools have a responsibility to provide a disciplined environment where all students can learn. There should be processes and procedures in place to assist the school leaders when administering student discipline. The author added that classroom discipline is of great importance in today's educational setting. Children are often disruptive because they are hungry, tired, unhappy, sad, or angry at a previous situation. They act out because they crave attention, feel left out, or are bored (Moorefield, 2005).

There may be many reasons for students acting out in the school environment. According to Strahan, Cope, Hundley, and Faircloth (2005), four categories exist to identify students who cause classroom discipline. The first category is avoiding schoolwork. This entails protecting self-esteem by not trying, rationalizing failure, and fear of ridicule from classmates. The second category includes those who seek attention. This entails clowning around and learned helplessness. The third category encompasses those students who create diversions by poking fun at tasks or classmates. Finally, the

fourth category includes those students included in playing power games. These students play tough and choose resistance as an identity (Strahan et al., 2005).

Currently, there has been a perception of many tribulations that are related to school discipline. In the opinion paper *What Every Administrator Needs to Know About Alternatives to Suspension and Expulsion*, Peterson (2009) identified what he believed to be the reason for the problems of discipline. The issues surrounding the negative public perception and discipline problems in schools occur because of the following: (a) negative media reports; (b) implementation of zero tolerance discipline policies originally intended to reduce behavior problems through consistent harsh punishment for any inappropriate behavior; (c) relying overly on suspension as the primary school discipline consequence and the large representation of racial and ethnic minorities among those who are suspended or expelled; (d) concern about legal requirements regarding the discipline of students with disabilities; and (e) emergence of data that seems to indicate that suspension and expulsion are not effective procedures to change student behavior. Peterson (2009) further suggested that the long-term negative side effects of suspension and expulsion include school drop out and could result in increased crime. Because of these negative effects, many schools have made an effort to decrease their number of suspensions and expulsions (Peterson, 2009).

Student behavior cannot be predicted, and as discussed earlier there may be various reasons for student misbehavior in school. According to Haley and Watson (2000), their research findings concluded that students were assigned to in-school suspension because they were angry, hostile, indifferent, and disillusioned with school. There was also evidence suggesting that most students were at risk of failing, while some

had been verbally abusive and confrontational. Haley and Watson (2000) also noted many common factors among students with severe behavioral issues. These students were found to have unemployed parents, encounters in the court system, strained living conditions, and poor parental control, and many were pinned with the responsibility of caring for their siblings. It is suggested that many times students bring their problems from the home and the neighborhood to school, which can eventually spill over into causing their misbehavior in class (Haley & Watson, 2000).

There are many different levels of misconduct and types of misbehavior present in the school setting. According to Chung and Paul (1996), many schools choose to use in-school suspension for minor infractions that may not warrant out-of-school suspension. Their work concluded that in-school suspension is widely used and can have a positive effect if implemented properly. The need for out-of-school suspension exists, but through in-school suspension, appropriate behavior must be encouraged and modeled for adolescents. There is definitely a need for an effective in-school suspension program in the educational setting, but the policy must include clear guidelines and goals, along with a supportive staff (Chung & Paul, 1996).

According to Costenbader and Markson (1994), in-school suspension serves as an alternative method of discipline that allows the student to experience a greater continuity of educational experiences. Turner (1998) agreed that students assigned to in-school suspension are able to have a positive learning experience that makes up for lost classroom time because they are able to complete assignments from the regular classroom. The literature shows support, according to Guindon (1992), for an in-school suspension program that encourages educational and emotional support. The research

further states that there must be certain requirements such as parent involvement, counseling, a strong philosophy, continued instruction, and collaborative decision making by the staff and parents for the program to be successful (Guindon, 1992).

Discipline and Violence in Schools

The United States has become a more violent society in recent years. This violence in society has been linked with many children's behavioral issues today. Chenoweth and Just (2000) stated that the lack of discipline in the classroom has been known to drive beginning teachers, as well as veteran teachers, into other professions. A paper presented by Nichols (1999) spoke about how, in 1969, a Gallup Poll presented a report representing attitudes of the public toward the nation's public schools. Classroom management and school discipline were topics of concern and continue to be 39 years later. It is evident, according to what the research has revealed, that poor student behavior impedes learning and student achievement.

The behaviors of today's youth, like American society, have changed drastically over the years. Volokh and Snell (1998), in their work on school violence prevention, discussed public school teachers' perceptions of misbehavior. In the 1940s, teachers ranked talking out of turn, chewing gum, making noise, running in the hall, cutting line, dress code, and littering as the top disciplinary issues. In 1990, the list by public school teachers had changed drastically to include drug and alcohol abuse, pregnancy, suicide, rape, robbery, and assault (Volokh & Snell, 1998). This supports the thought that society may be moving in the wrong direction. Schools have been linked to youth violence and criminal activity. In work done by Snyder and Sickmund (1997), they approximated that 56% of all property and violent crimes involving juveniles in 1991 occurred in school or

on school property. This led the researchers to suggest that there was no other places that would compare where crimes against adults were so concentrated (Snyder & Sickmund, 1997).

In a study performed by Lee (2007), it was suggested that because of the mounting student discipline issues, there have been many policies put into place on the national, state, and district levels. These policies, such as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), *Zero Tolerance*, and Gun-Free School Act of 1994, were put into place to help provide safe and orderly schools and identify student actions that require certain discipline actions (Lee, 2007).

Students must have rules to follow in school and consequences to suffer if they misbehave. The purpose of school discipline, according to Peterson (2009), includes: (a) changing student's behavior; (b) deterring or preventing other students from engaging in the behavior; (c) maintaining a safe school environment; (d) maintaining a decorum of the school; (e) providing retribution or the creation of suffering as punishment for a misdeed; (f) separating the problem student so adults will no longer have to cope with the student's bad behavior; (g) asserting adult authority by making clear to the students the power adults have over students; and (h) serving as a supplemental law enforcement agency (Peterson, 2009).

According to a paper published by the Advocates For Children and Youth (2006), children who are suspended are often those children who are least likely to have supervision at home. Some types of school discipline do not necessarily benefit the student or promote a change in his or her behavior. For example, research tends to suggest that there is a correlation between the use of suspension and delinquency. The

brief also suggested that children in households near or below poverty level are more likely to be expelled, along with the children with single parents being suspended or expelled from school more often. To help reduce the violence problem, school personnel must work to find the underlying causes of the student's disruptive behavior (Advocates For Children and Youth, 2006).

Laws and Regulations

According to *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), education is considered one of the most important functions of state and local governments. Yell, Drasgow, and Rozalski (2001) suggested that discipline must be maintained if students are to learn their roles and responsibilities in school and society. The solid enforcement of a strong and fair discipline policy should be in place to guide the students in the proper direction (Yell et al., 2001).

Hachiya (2010) suggested that local discipline policy and procedures being used to govern schools are derived from legislative actions and education department directives. Local school business is not always handled at the individual school level and, as described by Hachiya (2010), the local school boards and school superintendents make demands upon the local administrators working in schools. State and federal laws govern public schools and provide broad direction and funds to the districts. Local school boards derive their power and authority from their respective state governments, and they cannot enact rules and regulations that contradict the U.S. Constitution, their state constitution, or court interpretations of constitutional law (Hachiya, 2010).

Flanagain (2007) agreed that schools have policies and guidelines that dictate consequences and preventive measures dealing with student behavior. School districts

are given latitude to choose their responses to violence in their individual schools as long as they are within the state and federal regulations. Most school districts provide a student handbook that is viewed and possibly signed by the student and the parent at the beginning of each school year (Flanagain, 2007). Work done by Susswein (2000) implied that with the pressures of public perception and emphasis on safe schools, on many occasions schools have looked to policies that expel students for behavior that at one time would likely have been tolerated or even ignored.

In 1969, the passage of *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District* by The United States Supreme Court was a landmark decision that supported student freedom of expression rights. The idea was that students do not shed their constitutional rights at the schoolhouse gate (Hachiya, 2010). In an article written with regard to students' constitutional rights by Hurley (2002), it was noted that the constitutional rights of students in public school are not automatically coextensive with the rights of adults in other settings. This acknowledgment came from the Supreme Court decision of *Bethel School District No. 403 v. Frazier, 1986* (Hurley, 2002).

The court system has played an active part in setting procedures that dictate disciplinary actions in public schools. *School Law: Cases and Concepts*, written by LaMorte (2008), share that punishments for students who break rules must follow due process guidelines that were established for students in 1975. In accordance with *Goss v. Lopez* (1975), it was determined that the deprivation of a student's liberty or property was a serious enough life event to require due process. LaMorte (2008) also suggested that according to this decision, a school suspension of 10 or fewer days requires a notice of the charges to be made to the student and gives the student an opportunity to refute the

charges. Lower courts have determined, based on the requirements of the suspensions of 10 days or less, that it is apparent that more due process is required for suspensions of greater length (LaMorte, 2008). Bartlett and McCullagh (1993) proposed that the decision of *Goss v. Lopez* (1975) encourages the use of in-school suspension through addressing the procedural due process rights of students. The decision also requires public school authorities to review their current policies and make necessary changes to stay within the law (Bartlett & McCullagh, 1993).

Students with special needs are not immune to behavioral problems in class. Brown (2007) explored the overuse and misuse of removing students and discussed the laws that have been put into place to protect students with special needs. The removal of special education students for discipline issues, though not impossible, provides different issues than those of a regular education student. The Individuals with Disabilities Act, or IDEA, governs activities surrounding special education students. According to Brown (2007), IDEA provides the following guidelines that should be followed when removing a protected student:

A student with a documented disability cannot not be removed from his or her present educational placement for more than 10 days if (a) the behavior that precipitated the disciplinary action is a manifestation of his or her disability and/or (b) if he or she was not provided appropriate services and supports, as outlined in his or her individual education plan (IEP). (p. 437)

Schools must ensure that students who are protected by IDEA when they are assigned to in-school suspension receive general education instruction. The instruction must be the same as if they were not suspended, according to Ann Logsdon (2011), a

leading school psychologist in the field of educational and developmental disabilities. Students should also receive services provided by their individual educational plan and, if schools follow these guidelines, they should fulfill any requirements under the law (Logsdon, 2011).

Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2009), approximately one out of every 14 students in 2006 was suspended out of school, while at the same time, one out of every 476 students was expelled from school. When a student is suspended out of school or expelled from school the student has a difficult time keeping up with his or her academic requirements. Student discipline issues rank very high as being problematic concerns within schools. Expulsions were defined as excluding students from school for disciplinary reasons and removing students from the attendance rolls (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Peterson (2009) stated that many problems exist with current school discipline codes and their educational nature, although the administering of penalties for misbehavior and certain steps for handling discipline are usually guided by board policy and procedures. Peterson suggested that administrators can begin to change some regulations to better reflect their goals and better meet the needs of their students. Traditional school disciplinary consequences discussed by Peterson (2009) for use by administrators included detention, Saturday school, parent conferences, additional homework, writing lines, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and expulsion. The severity of the misbehavior will usually dictate how most of these consequences are

administered. When assigning discipline to students, it is imperative for their protection that the school administrator follows school and district policy (Peterson, 2009).

The effectiveness of out-of-school suspension in reducing or eliminating behavioral problems in students is not strongly supported by research. In the article *Ten Alternatives to Suspension*, Peterson (2005) suggested that educators are beginning to understand that the assigning of out-of-school suspension and expulsions are not changing student behaviors. Exclusionary consequences are believed to make the suspended student's academic progress more difficult and are likely to increase the student's chances of dropping out of school or incurring other negative outcomes (Peterson, 2005).

Corporal Punishment

Hyman (1995) reported that since the early 1970s debates have raged regarding the effectiveness of corporal punishment as a means to change student behavior. Corporal punishment has lost its popularity and, as of late, it is being used less and less (Hyman, 1995). Research conducted by Owen (2005) indicated an increase of student compliance immediately after the administration of corporal punishment by a school official. However, the Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003) reported that there are no data suggesting an increase in a student's social skills from the use of corporal punishment or that this discipline strategy encourages children to maintain more self-control over time. There has also been a shift in the general attitudes of society about corporal punishment. Over 40 organizations, including the American Bar Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Education Association, according to the

Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003), have gone on record as opposing the use of corporal punishment in schools as a form of disciplining students.

According to Portner (1998) corporal punishment has lost its popularity and only serves to teach the notion that might makes right or the only the strong will rule. The work suggested there is a sweeping general concurrence that this type of violence or discipline does not get to the root cause of student misbehavior. This is evident through discipline records often reveal that the same students are constantly the recipients of corporal punishment (Portner, 1998). An article by Teicher (2005) stated that between 1980 and 2000 there has been a decline in the number of students struck in U.S. public schools from 1.4 million to 342,000. While the discipline strategy has declined in use, the subjects of the discipline are traditionally marginalized students, children with disabilities, and boys (Teicher, 2005).

Rationale for In-School Suspension

Effective discipline is the key to a school failing or being successful. *Administrator's Complete School Discipline Guide*, a book by Robert Ramsey (1994) suggests that "without order, safety, and a sense of security and civility, schools can't work and learning will not occur" (p. 7). When discipline issues arise, it is in the best interest of the school administrator, depending on the seriousness of the violation, to keep the student in school in an educational environment (Noddings, 2005). Schools tend to be under a close eye by the public and public schools are under enormous pressure to show through test scores that they are providing every student with an appropriate education according to Noddings (2005).

Gootman (1998) explained that in-school suspension is a discipline model where the student is removed from the classroom and required to stay in a specific area for a specific length of time. Anderson (2009) agreed that an in-school suspension models can remove the students and place them in a variety of places. These places vary from a regular classroom staffed by a teacher or paraprofessional to a small room and supervised by an administrator or office assistant. At the same time, in-school suspension allows instructional time to continue because students bring their work to the assigned location to complete during the school day (Anderson, 2009). Stiefer (2003) suggested that in-school suspension is designed to offset the negative effects of long-term exclusion and out-of-school suspension from school. Sheets (1996), in accordance with this train of thought, recommended that students assigned to in-school suspension should have the ability to receive assistance and have academic learning time.

It is understood that not all behavior deserves the same consequences. Morrison, Anthony, Storino, and Dillon (2001) reported that there are certain student misbehaviors that the classroom teacher chooses to handle and those that are referred to the office. Certain research has established that disobedience, general disruptions, defiance, and physical contact or fighting have been identified as the behaviors most likely to result in an office referral (Morrison et al., 2001). According to Skiba et al. (1997) and their survey of school administrators, the offense most likely to result in a suspension of a student is aggression. The main issue surfacing was how aggression would be defined. Their work found that many times principals disagreed on a common definition of aggression. The school administrators who were surveyed identified other behaviors such as disrespect, noncompliance, defiance, general school disruption, truancy, and tardiness

as frequently resulting in an office referral and ultimately the suspension of the student. These findings suggest that the use of school suspensions vary depending on the administrator (Skiba et al., 1997). Research supports the idea that if the handling of the less severe behaviors is not done properly, it could lead to more severe issues.

There is no discrepancy in the fact that low academic achievement is a marker for students with possible behavioral problems. Morrison et al. (2001) found that repeat office visits were made by students who were low performing and at risk both behaviorally and academically. This leads to major problems within the educational system and could have an increased impact on the number of dropouts that occur yearly (Morrison et al., 2001). According to Deridder (1991), suspensions and expulsions rated in the top three school-related reasons for a student leaving school early and heavily increased the student's chances of dropping out of school. On the other hand, the article suggested that keeping a disruptive student in class can be counterproductive to the main goal of educating the child. Opuni, Tullis, Sanchez, and Gonzalez (1991) found out-of-school suspensions are commonly used but can be viewed by the students and parents as giving them a holiday. They also suggested that when a decision is made to keep the student in class it may be perceived as punishment to the teacher. One of the positive aspects of school suspension is the ability to discipline the student and not having to remove them from the academic setting (Opuni et al., 1991).

A report by Vanderslice (1999) stated that frustration can be a direct result of a suspension from school for the returning student trying to catch up and stay current with the lessons. All of the resources and strategies that are available to the school administrator should be used when discipline action is necessary. An out-of-school

suspension for a minor wrongdoing can cause more problems and may not help the student's educational process (Vanderslice, 1999).

Many schools across the country incorporate some type of in-school suspension program. According to research done by Guindon (1992), the practice is used mostly in middle and senior high school and very seldom on the elementary level. According to an article by Adams (2000), since the early 1980s in-school suspension programs have gained in popularity. The reasons include: (a) keeping disruptive students on campus; (b) allowing students to receive valuable instruction while being under disciplinary rule; (c) preventing students from being taken out of the educational delivery system; (d) keeping the disruptive students from engaging in antisocial behaviors during school operating hours; and (e) addressing the discipline problems confronting educators (Adams, 2000).

In a study on in-school suspension, Boone (2006) made the argument that the school suspension programs help to overcome the weaknesses of traditional suspension by not depriving problem students of an educational experience. Southard (2002) believed in-school suspension serves as an avenue to lower the number of out-of-school suspensions, trancies, and the public's perception of discipline in schools. It can improve in reducing the effects that suspensions have on the dropout rate by providing a workable disciplinary consequence within the learning environment (Southard, 2002).

Costenbader and Markson (1998), in their work on school suspension, proposed that external or out-of-school suspension is thought to be ineffective and may be counterproductive in some instances. In contrast, in-school suspension serves as a cost effective alternative to suspension of the student out of school as a disciplinary method (Costenbader & Markson, 1998). However, the results from Silvey's (1995) study

showed that students who had been assigned to in-school suspension showed no significant difference in academic achievement before and after serving their time. Using a method such as in-school suspension can create a setting that offers the educational process a sense of stability. When disciplining students, school officials seek to avoid some of the disadvantages of external suspension. Suspending students out of school has become a commonly used method of disciplining students even though research supports it to be ineffective in changing their behavior (Silvey, 1995).

The financial results of keeping students in school are alarming. According to Storm (1998), a school district in Tucson, Arizona, with approximately 14,800 students, devised several alternatives to suspension that reduced dramatically the number of youngsters who spent their days out of school. As a result of the alternatives, attendance improved, which, in turn, increased their state aid reimbursement. During the 1996-1997 school year, the school district recovered 5,770 days of attendance, amounting to \$106,745 (Storm, 1998).

A study conducted by Lee (2007) in a high school in Atlanta, Georgia, revealed that more than half the students polled preferred in-school suspension to detention, and half preferred out-of-school suspension to in-school suspension. This study suggested that students preferred out-of-school suspension, and the consequence of detention was considered more punishment than in-school suspension. Lee (2007) reported that students involved in the study viewed out-of-school suspension as a vacation and did not see the importance of being in school. With most students viewing the extension of the school day in the form of detention as more punishment, it suggests the students would rather be

serving time during the regular class hours. This thought process could lead to the belief that students do not value the educational process (Lee, 2007).

Lee's (2007) study leads to questions regarding the level of effectiveness of this specific discipline process. Students preferring in-school suspension to detention and those students preferring out-of-school suspension over in-school suspension could cloud the overall intention of the administrators' use of the punishments (Lee, 2007). Other research agreed that a majority of students see in-school suspension as a more punishable discipline tool than out-of-school suspension (Siskind et al., 1993).

Characteristics of Effective In-School Suspension Programs

The structure and design of an in-school suspension program, according to Gushee (1984), promotes the students receiving individualized instruction while they are serving in a secluded environment outside the regular classroom. In-school suspension is a program where students have an in-house assignment rather than an out-of-school suspension (Gushee, 1984). Wheelock (1986) felt that in-school suspension programs were a step in the right direction; but if they were to be left unmonitored, the program could create a false impression of student progress. Research indicates that a good measure of the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program would be the number of repeat visits to the program by the students. If a student is repeatedly required to go to in-school suspension, then it is unlikely that the program is having its intended impact (Wheelock, 1986).

Sheets (1996), in an article on effective program design, included the characteristic of good sound policies, procedures, and the necessity of an evaluation component for the program to succeed. Sheets (1996) suggested that for any in-school

suspension program to be effective it must have a solid design and a setting where the students generally do not like to attend. The program must be developed with a strong philosophy and mission statement, which must clearly define the goals and direction of the program (Sheets, 1996).

In the implementation of an in-school suspension program, Southard (2002) suggested that the administrators consider the following five important organizational questions:

1. What do schools hope to accomplish through the implementation of an in-school suspension program?
2. How will the implementation of in-school suspension affect student achievement, student discipline, school climate, and the learning environment?
3. What are the effects on academic achievement of at-risk students, exceptional students, and the remaining student population?
4. What conditions are necessary to effectively implement an in-school suspension program?
5. What necessary skills will the staff need? (p. 2)

Hrabak and Settles (2007) concluded that an inadequately designed in-school suspension program would be more likely to have the same effect on students academically and socially as an out-of-school suspension program would. It is important to keep in mind that in-school suspension serves as a strategy intended to be a punishment for behavioral violations. An effective program should hold students

accountable for school assignments and involve some aspect of rehabilitation or behavior assessment (Morris & Howard, 2003).

Morris and Howard (2003), in their investigations, found that there were five common characteristics of effective in-school suspension programs used early on, which were also found in the implementation of current programs. The characteristics included isolation of the students, having separate eating accommodations, limiting the students' time spent in the program from three to five days, making sure talking was not permitted, and finally ensuring that the students completed their regular class assignments (Morris & Howard, 2003).

Sullivan (1989) shared that when preparing to initiate a program in a school setting it is essential to plan collaboratively, and designing an in-school suspension program is no different. To ensure the success and to get a strong buy-in from those involved with the in-school suspension program, it is important to plan collaboratively. According to Sullivan (1989), it is essential to include faculty, staff, parents, and students in the planning process. Training the stakeholders in the philosophy, objectives, and strategies of the program is essential to the program's success. A collaborative effort to promote the in-school suspension program and the cooperation of all of the possible members in its development will lead to its being considered effective (Sullivan, 1989).

Parents are a very important component in building a successful school program. Hrabak and Settles (2007) noted the parent as an important stakeholder who should be invited to participate in the planning process and development of the in-school suspension program. They gave the following as reasons parents should be involved. Parents can help by serving as a support system to the program, they can help to identify

any additional at-risk factors of the students, and they can help in encouraging good student behavior. Making parent contacts throughout the process should be expected, especially when their child is a participant of the in-school suspension program (Hrabak & Settles, 2007).

Guidelines published by The Advantage Press (2010) referred to a good in-school suspension program as being one that the students will never want to attend again. The guidelines call for the in-school suspension program to be isolated and with a favorable work environment, along with a supervisor who is firm and can keep the students on task. Having rules that promote task-oriented behavior and a process where administrators and teachers establish the activities for the students to perform are also vital components (Advantage Press, 2010).

An article written by Sullivan (1989) establishing elements of a successful in-school suspension program recommended that when the rules and procedures are clearly defined and communicated in written form the program is less likely to stray from its original mission. For ISS programs, the students should be expected to abide by the rules, and the person in charge must be able to strongly enforce the rules. The ISS staff is important for program success. "Full-time, qualified, and trained staff members are critical to the success of any in-school suspension program" (Sullivan, 1989, p. 36).

Vanderslice (1999) noted the importance of students understanding that in-school suspension is not a place but a program. An in-school suspension program should not be viewed as a holding area, and students should be given the opportunity to complete regular class assignments without penalty (Vanderslice, 1999). Burns (2007) described respect, student accountability, student noncompliance, location of room, student-to-

teacher ratio, and amount of time assigned as key components to an effective in-school suspension program. These components provide the school with a solid program that will help hold students accountable (Burns, 2007).

Lee (2007) concluded that there is no agreement on which role the in-school suspension instructor should take. The three preferred roles are identified as authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. The authoritative role is complete control without explanation. The authoritarian role is complete control with no questions asked. Finally, the permissive role is very little control with a focus on the students controlling their own behavior. Lee (2007) added that no matter what style of leadership is shown, a vital component of a successful program is a competent leader in charge to help the students with their lessons and help with remediation. There must also be resources available to the instructor to help keep the students current with their lessons and assist in behavioral modification (Lee, 2007). According to Patterson (1985), the in-school suspension teacher may also take a role as a tutor and serve in remediation of the students. The tutoring of an entire class of disruptive students in various subjects is believed to be one of the most challenging parts of teaching in an in-school suspension program (Patterson, 1985).

According to Vanderslice (1999), there should be regularly scheduled visits by the school administration to evaluate the daily operation of the in-school suspension program. Many times the in-school suspension program receives a lack of attention and will go unevaluated, resulting in the failure of a program (Vanderslice, 1999). It is agreed that a continual evaluation component must be in place that measures students' behavioral change over time and determines if the objectives of the program are being

accomplished (Sheets, 1996). This can be accomplished, according to Sullivan (1989), by continual monitoring, including statistical data and perceptions of the administration and staff. It is suggested that committees should be used to analyze data, reassess goals and objectives, make revisions, and offer recommendations for ISS (Sullivan, 1989).

In-School Suspension Models

According to Southard (2002), there are several models of in-school suspension such as punitive, discussion, academic, individual, and enhanced or therapeutic. Most in-school suspension programs follow one of the following three models: punitive, academic, or therapeutic (Morris & Howard, 2003).

The punitive model uses a very restrictive environment. Referrals can be as long as 10 days, including minimum restroom breaks, and allow no talking. Students spend the entire time completing assignments and doing punitive work. This model is believed to eliminate misbehavior and is probably the most widely used (Morris & Howard, 2003).

The academic model, as explained by Sheets (1996), is based on the assumption that most discipline problems arise when students have learning difficulties. Sheets (1996) added that a trained in-school suspension teacher measures the assessment of student achievement. When the evaluation is complete, the appropriate instruction and resources are given to the student (Sheets, 1996).

Haley and Watson (2000) devised a similar literacy-based in-school suspension program that was nonpunitive and required students to spend time on academic tasks. A writing component was used to improve their writing skills and have them reflect on their misbehavior (Haley & Watson, 2000).

The next model covered is the therapeutic model. Morris and Howard (2003) described the models as being designed to help the students in discussing why they were assigned to in-school suspension. The therapeutic model is centered on providing the student with problem-solving skills to help with behavior modification (Morris & Howard, 2003). Along with any specific goals of this model Whitfield and Bulach (1996) claimed that there should be an attempt to improve the self-image and communication skills of the students. They went on to reveal counseling as an important part of this model and suggested that most in-school suspension programs are more punitive in nature and that counseling is rarely used to help students. An in-school suspension model should have a therapeutic component to address negative behaviors, and interventions should be present, helping to improve students' self-esteem, awareness of their damaging behaviors, and to improve their problem solving skills (Whitfield & Bulach, 1996).

Another role that the teacher should take while overseeing in-school suspension is that of a counselor, as defined by Gootman (1998). He believed that the teacher could act in a supportive role and make a personal connection with the students, take an interest in them, and provide them with support, while remaining firm to behavior guidelines. Having a smaller group than a regular class, it was thought that this counseling approach could provide the opportunity to affect change in an individual's behavior (Gootman, 1998).

According to The Advantage Press (2010), supervising the in-school suspension program can be one of the most difficult jobs in the school. The supervisors are expected not only to enforce the rules, but they must also work well with the students. A study conducted by Blomberg (2004) compared in-school and out-of-school suspension. The

research reported on what effects in-school suspension would have on the rate of violent acts committed by students. It was observed that the intervention offered by a trained teacher of in-school suspension helped to reduce the violent acts committed by students and that there was an overall change in students for the better (Blomberg, 2004). This research suggested that a trained in-school suspension teacher in a therapeutic model will have a positive effect on student behavior.

The individual model is a fourth model that combines the three that were previously mentioned, while including a student evaluation component, according to Sheets (1996). This evaluation helps to determine the reason the student is behaving badly and identifies which program would be helpful (Sheets, 1996). Southard (2002) reported that this is a strict model in which there is a pencil sharpener, paper, dictionary, and supervision. Students bring their work from the regular class and complete it throughout the day, and the supervisor's only interaction with the students is about their work (Southard, 2002).

Research has shown that creating a link of communication between the parents and the school will improve student performance and promote the success of school programs. According to Fullan et al. (2006), students make greater progress when parents, caregivers, and the community are supportive of the work of the school and partnerships are formed between the school, parents, and community.

Goals of In-School Suspension Programs

School discipline policies should be easy to understand and readily distinguish between categories of offenses and, according to the work of Gaustad (1992), minor infractions may be treated with certain flexibility such as in-school suspension.

Depending on the circumstances, nonnegotiable consequences such as out-of-school suspension are set for more serious offenses (Gaustad, 1992). It was also agreed upon by Patterson (1985) that students who get suspended out of school fall behind academically, and the goal of the school should be to keep the students on track and have them back in the classroom. Patterson (1985) argued that by causing a student to miss instructional time, the school is setting the student up for failure. The design and purpose of in-school suspension allows the students to maintain their academic standing while at the same time serve their time for misbehavior (Patterson, 1985).

It was reported by Skiba and Peterson (2003) that in-school suspension was developed to serve as an alternative to traditional methods of discipline. According to their report, most agree that the purpose of an in-school suspension program is to keep students in school and academically engaged while they are being disciplined. In the opinion of many, there is little doubt that keeping students in school and in a learning environment would have beneficial results (Skiba & Peterson, 2003).

Peterson (2005) stated that a good in-school suspension program should include academic tutoring, instruction on skill building related to the student behavior problem, and a clearly defined procedure for returning to class that is contingent on the student's progress or behavior while serving in the program. He also suggested that the program be carefully managed to guard against students using in-school suspension as a way to avoid attending classes (Peterson, 2005).

There are many desired products for an effective in-school suspension program that were reported on by Cummings (2009). The effectiveness of the program revolves around reducing out-of-school suspensions, providing academic support, providing

students with skills in conflict resolution, providing students with counseling and behavioral support, improving attendance, decreasing the dropout rate, increasing academic performance, and improving school climate (Cummings, 2009). Because of the positive effect of the identified outcomes, Cummings (2009) noted the importance of planning and collaboration when building the in-school suspension program. Cotton and Savard (1982) agreed that the in-school suspension classroom should promote discipline and learning and enable the student to not fall behind academically. The school and classroom structures, which enable students to experience academic or social success, are effective in enhancing motivation and remediating discipline problems (Cotton & Savard, 1982).

Whitfield and Bulach (1996) explained that when referring to effective in-school suspension programs the stated purpose of a solid program must include: (a) helping the child; (b) getting to the root of the problem and remedying it; (c) providing students with assistance in developing self-discipline; (d) understanding factors that contribute to discipline problems to help prevent future problems; (e) doing away with out-of-school suspension; and (f) providing assistance to faculty to achieve the first five goals.

Everybody's Business: A Book About School Discipline (First & Mizell, 1980) noted that in any in-school suspension program there should be a clear statement of purpose. They claimed that along with having a clear purpose, there should also be written procedures that are developed collaboratively with teachers, students, and parents. These procedures should clearly state the steps in the referral process and explain what behaviors will result in a student being assigned to in-school suspension. There should be

a designated administrator responsible for determining if the assignment of in-school suspension is the appropriate consequence for the misbehavior (First & Mizell, 1980).

School-wide programs, along with in-school suspension programs, have been designed to help students improve their attitude, study skills, behavior, self-esteem, and academic achievement, according to Sheets (1996). For the in-school suspension program to accomplish this, it must be appropriately designed and maintained. Sheets (1996) also noted that the program has to be an effective part of the school's total philosophy on discipline. First and Mizell (1980) estimated that to reach the goal of student betterment, there should be frequent teacher interaction by providing the students with resources daily, and a counseling component should be available to the student. The students' work should be monitored and their progress followed because it is imperative that the students not fall behind while in the program (First & Mizell, 1980).

According to Ramsey (1994), discipline in schools is a product of the partnership between the school and the parents. Parents play a key role in solving school discipline issues, and their involvement is essential and should be encouraged. Parents must be notified of their student's progress, and successful schools should look to engage the parents as allies in the discipline process (Ramsey, 1994). A report by Melton (2001) suggested that parents appear to be supportive of ISS programs.

Researchers agree that the goals and purposes of a program must be clearly defined to get the desired outcomes, although having the goals and purposes clearly outlined may not be enough. According to the report by Chung and Paul (1996), in-school suspension does not always meet the needs of the students academically, therapeutically, or socially. Gootman (1998) believed that success may depend on the

individual student and his or her tribulations. In-school suspension can be successful for the student who misbehaves occasionally, but usually fails with those students who have larger problems and issues (Gootman, 1998).

To sum up the goals of in-school suspension, Mendez (1977), reported that the programs should be embedded in promoting the students' success. These successes should come about by combining the tasks and responsibilities of helping the students reach their educational potential along with administering discipline (Mendez, 1977).

Effectiveness of In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions

Many times in-school suspension programs and out-of-school suspensions fail to address the cause of the schools' discipline issues. Wheelock (1986) explained that at times the suspension programs may hide the fact that a large number of students are being excluded from their classrooms. In some schools, an in-school suspension room can become what some refer to as a dumping ground to rid the teachers of students who may be causing problems relating to the teacher having management issues (Wheelock, 1986).

There are many different views about the effects of suspensions through the in-school or out-of-school suspension programs in the educational arena. Suspension aids in the removal of the source of the disruption to the other students in the classroom and away from other students in the school (Volokh & Snell, 1998). In a study of ISS perceptions, Melton (2001) reported that high school principals feel that ISS programs are better than OSS because they keep students in school and address inappropriate behavior while keeping students in a school setting. While suspending students out of school is sometimes necessary, it has been shown to do little for the student's academic

achievement. Some findings imply that it would likely increase discipline problems due to the frustration of the returning student who may find himself or herself in a situation where he or she is trying to catch up with assignments (Vanderslice, 1999).

Lee (2007) found that teacher and administrator support of the in-school suspension program is vital for it to succeed. The use of in-school suspension can be influenced by the school administrators' philosophy on disruptive behavior or the teachers' belief that students prefer in-school suspension to the classroom (Lee, 2007).

When teachers believe in the administrator's ability to discipline effectively, then the discipline program can be successful, according to Chung and Paul (1996), although when teachers and administrators use in-school suspension too frequently, the program may be viewed as inconsistent and not working. The in-school suspension program will lose its validity with the students and the teachers if it is not used consistently, and having a variety of discipline strategies available to maintain discipline is important (Chung & Paul, 1996).

According to Lee (2007), there is a high correlation between a students' grades, their self-esteem, family situations, and their repeated visits to in-school suspension. A program that includes an academic and therapeutic component would be more successful than that of just a punitive model (Lee, 2007). Sullivan (1989) noted that the rehabilitative potential of an in-school suspension program grows when a person who has knowledge of the student's academic and behavioral history counsels the student.

Students who frequently visit in-school suspension may receive less instruction, hand in lower quality work, have less interest in classroom activities, and feel as though they were not a part of the class family (Chung & Paul, 1996). Students assigned in-

school suspension are ultimately removed from what they needed most, according to Di Lullo (2004), which is interaction with the teacher.

The lack of classroom management and student discipline is a clear concern of teachers and parents. According to Nichols (1999), no clear evidence exists to suggest that in-school or out-of-school suspension works to deter student misbehavior. In-school suspension may be seen as a positive intervention because it supposedly provides an avenue of discipline without disrupting the educational process (Nichols, 1999). Di Lullo (2004) determined that in-school suspension might not be an effective or an efficient type of discipline. It was reported that some students might use it purposely as a quiet place to be assigned so that they can miss class or catch up on their work (Di Lullo, 2004).

Student Academic Achievement

One of the main issues facing school leaders on a daily basis is the academic achievement of students. With the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), along with the new Common Core State Standards, states have set benchmark goals to help ensure that all children are reaching their potential. With this high accountability in place, schools have made an effort to keep students in school and offer an alternative to out-of-school suspension (Advocates for Children and Youth, 2006).

The incorporation of in-school suspension helps to aid educators in their efforts to ensure the successful continuation of the learning process for those students who may misbehave. Research conducted by Silvey (1995) measured whether in-school suspension was beneficial or detrimental to academic success. There was comparison made of their grades before and after the students served in-school suspension for English and science. The researcher found a decline in the science grade but no significant change

in the English grade. It was believed that English made an easier transition in the in-school suspension setting than the hands-on approach of science (Silvey, 1995).

Tobin and Sugai (1999) found relationships between academic performance and problem behavior across grade levels. In the same study, they found that individual student academic failure in high school was correlated with three or more suspensions in ninth grade. There was a correlation between grade point average and specific types of office referrals for some students. Putnam, Horner, and Algozzine (2006) demonstrated in their research that students with severe behavior problems experienced larger academic deficits as compared to their typical peers. This suggests that student behavior does affect academic achievement.

Marzano (2003), in his book *What Works in Schools*, presented three factors that account for a large share of a student's achievement. These factors include home environment, learned intelligence and background knowledge, along with motivation. He suggested that all three are important but can be overcome (Marzano, 2003).

A key component of an effective in-school suspension program, according to Burns (2007), is that students must be held accountable. The idea of accountability is driven by the teacher and administrator developing a mechanism to provide assignments to the students on a daily basis. Academic achievement can only be improved if the students receive their assignments and they are checked for completeness and routed back to those who provided the assignment (Burns, 2007).

In-school suspension offers the students an opportunity to do academic work under faculty supervision. With this in mind, the focus on the academic well being of the students might not have been accomplished under the traditional out-of-school model

(Harvey & Moosha, 1977). According to the work of Hrabak and Settles (2007), the academic and social progress of the students referred to in-school suspension can be monitored to help determine the effectiveness of the suspension program. Many of the students who show poor behavior are not academically successful; therefore, an in-school suspension program that utilizes strategies such as writing, problem solving, and behavior modification activities, along with aid for current schoolwork, can better provide academic success (Hrabak & Settles, 2007).

Harvey and Moosha (1977) discovered in their research that in-school suspension was more effective than out-of-school suspension in changing student behaviors. Based on a study of two Virginia schools, there were a fewer number of students suspended when there was an option of in-school suspension available to the school administrators. In this case, the number of suspensions was reduced along with the number of repeat offenders. Although a behavior change may have been made in the student population, there were still problems that occurred instructionally with the in-school suspension program (Harvey & Moosha, 1977).

Additional problems could occur with in-school suspension programs and the experience of the instructor or their omission from the regular classroom. Mendez and Sanders (1981) confirmed that the staff of a typical in-school suspension program consists of one teacher who could not provide expertise in all academic areas. It is suggested that students may have work in various disciplines and that the in-school suspension instructor may lack the familiarity of the curriculum or course content. Due to this type of issue, students assigned to in-school suspension may fall behind (Mendez & Sanders, 1981).

A report by Iselin (2010) suggested that incorporating a comprehensive school-wide behavioral program may have a beneficial effect on lowering discipline problems. Programs that are positive, consistent, regulated, and culturally sensitive are likely to lead to fewer school suspensions and are also much more likely to enhance students' current and future academic achievements and encourage successes in the students' lives (Iselin, 2010).

School-Wide Discipline Strategies

Many schools are looking for avenues to improve student behavior outside of traditional discipline actions. The National Center for Education Statistics (2005) completed a survey that recognized disruptions caused by violence in the nation's public schools as a national concern. The survey found that 78% of schools reported having some type of formal violence prevention or violence reduction program or effort (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). According to Brugman (2004), many school districts have implemented some form of violence awareness or prevention program in an effort to address school safety issues to reduce and prevent violence on campus.

Landau and Gathercoal (2000) stated that keeping schools safe while preserving productive learning environments is an increasing concern for educators everywhere. School personnel are constantly seeking strategies that will help students learn to act respectfully and responsibly (Landau & Gathercoal, 2000).

Positive Alternatives to School Suspension (P.A.S.S.), according to Boone (2006), is an in-school suspension program that focuses on preventive behaviors and counseling of the at-risk students. Boone (2006) shared that the program is a

collaborative effort from the school, parents, and the community in an effort to help the students. According to Delisio (2008), students are graded daily in five areas based on a rubric provided to the students and the parents. The areas include attendance, tardiness, ability to follow rules, behavior, and work habits in class. If the students accumulate a certain amount of points for discipline issues, they are transferred to out-of-school suspension. If they complete the program they are put back in regular classes. Students are immediately responsible for their success or failure (Delisio, 2008).

Boone (2006) referred to On Campus Intervention Program (OCIP), as a therapeutic program developed by Suspensions Solution Incorporated that provides students with academic guidance, life skills training, and counseling. The program's goals include providing a positive alternative to out-of-school suspension, decreasing dropout rates, and keeping students on track academically while modifying the attitudes and behaviors of students, according to Boone (2006).

Character education has been around since the first public schools, according to a report by the Character Education Partnership (2010). This initiative is an intentional effort to build the value system of students. This report stated that the character education program offers students the opportunity to be given the support they need to be successful. Schools of character work with students so that they will understand how their behavior affects others. There is an effort made for the misbehaving student to reflect, problem solve, and give restitution (Character Education Partnership, 2010).

Student Assignment Centers (SAC) is another program designed to enhance student attitudes about school through the use of motivation, skills building, formulating study habits, and setting goals (Opuni et al., 1991). The SAC principles are based on

positive reinforcement, and the program attempts to improve self-esteem, enhance academic achievement, and change student behavior (Lee, 2007).

Lee (2007) noted that having alternate discipline strategies could be helpful in the overall discipline policy of a school. It has been shown that in-school suspension programs do not always support student behavior change. It has also been noted that placement of students into an in-school suspension setting is often subjective, prejudicial, and mostly punitive (Lee, 2007).

Peterson (2005) provided research-based alternatives to suspension. He suggested that the following examples demonstrate positive behavioral change outcomes and provide for the opportunity to keep students in school:

1. Problem solving/contracting - negotiation and problem-solving approaches can be used to assist students in identifying alternative behavior choices.
2. Restitution - in-kind restitution permits the student to help to restore or improve the school environment physically.
3. Mini-courses or skill modules - short courses or self-study modules can be assigned as a disciplinary consequence. These should be on topics related to the student's inappropriate behavior.
4. Parent involvement - parents are invited to brainstorm ways they can provide close supervision or be more involved in their child's schooling.
5. Counseling - students may be required to receive support or individual counseling focused on problem solving or personal issues interfering with learning.

6. Community service - these programs permit the student to perform a required amount of time in supervised community service outside of school hours.
7. Behavior monitoring - closely monitoring behavior and academic progress will permit rewards to be provided for successful performance.
8. Coordinated behavior plans - creation of a structured coordinated behavior support plan specific to the student and focused on increasing desirable behavior, and replacing inappropriate behaviors.
9. Alternative programming - provide short-or long-term changes in the student schedule, classes or course content or offer the option of participating in an independent study or work-experience program.
10. Appropriate in-school suspension - in-school suspension should be provided and include academic tutoring and instruction on skill building related to the student behavior problem. (pp. 10-11)

Finally, Christle, Nelson, and Jolivette (2004) recognized Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) as a school-wide behavioral support program that is gaining recognition as a successful approach to student discipline across the country, with some schools reporting a 20% to 60% reduction in office discipline referrals and suspensions. For change to be realized on a school level, the approach must be implemented school wide, and it must be sustained argued Christle et al. (2004).

Research by Anderson (2009) demonstrated that every type of school-wide discipline program may not decrease the number of office discipline referrals or reduce the number of students being referred to in-school suspension or out-of-school suspension. However, Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports does provide an

alternative approach to school disciplinary practices that have been proven in some degree to decrease the frequency of school discipline (Anderson, 2009).

According to Skiba and Sprague (2008), a school-wide positive behavior support program has three main components: prevention, multi-tiered support, and data-based decision making. Prevention depends on both defining and teaching school-wide behavioral expectations, along with establishing a consistent system to reward appropriate behavior. Having consequences and supportive re-teaching for students who exhibit problem behavior is important. Schools with clear rules and reward systems experience fewer discipline problems. Finally, data-based decision making enables educators to design the most effective preventive and reactive supports (Skiba & Sprague, 2008). This type of program represents a proactive approach to discipline, which focuses on teaching and supporting positive behavior in the entire student body by providing students with examples of positive replacement behaviors (Advocates For Children & Youth, 2006).

As reported by Cummings (2009), the positive behavior program is designed as a team concept. The teachers work collaboratively with the administration to create procedures along with discipline forms that measure minor and major offenses. This approach is designed to keep discipline at a consistent level. In-school suspension programs should be one part of a school-wide strategy for creating and sustaining a positive, nurturing school climate based on respectful relationships between teachers and students, teachers and teachers, and students and students (Cummings, 2009).

Student Behavior

Research studies have linked emotional and behavioral student problems with many areas such as peer interaction and the students' social position or status. According to Sroufe, Duggal, Weinfeld, and Carlson (2000), research has found that teacher rankings of peer competence, beginning in early elementary school, can predict behavior problems and psychopathology throughout childhood and adolescence. Developmental psychopathology refers to the study of the development of psychological disorders that can include conduct or behavior disorders (Sroufe et al., 2000). The area of developmental psychopathology, referred to by Morrison and D'Incau (2000), provides a model for exploring the complex, intricate issues that impact students as they move through their school years. The relationship between school discipline and the students' mental state occurs in the onset, course, and outcome of problematic behaviors and examines the context in which these behaviors occur (Morrison & D'Incau, 2002).

There could be various reasons for student misbehavior. However, the school environment can serve as a predictor. A variety of contingencies such as crowded halls, poor heating, dim lighting, and frequent intercom interruptions can affect student behavior, according to Weisz (1994). Additionally, discipline problems are embedded in the social and organizational structure of the schools, which may cause the students to feel marginal or alienated (Weisz, 1994).

Ediger (2002) offered strategies to use when dealing with student behavior. Problem-solving procedures, the use of positive reinforcement, as well as the use of a time-out area in the classroom are suggested for teacher use. Some strategies focus on measures that enforce disciplinary action such as the implementation of a behavior code

or set of expectations for the students (Ediger, 2002). Volokh and Snell (1998) mentioned in their study that the use of a behavioral code may not aid in the improvement of student behavior. “While behavior codes are popular, there is little evidence that they have decreased misbehavior; school disruptions and violence did not decrease and emphasis on rules and punishment increased” (Volokh & Snell, 1998, p. 27).

According to Boone (2006), in the book *Antisocial Behavior in School* by Hill Walker, there are four strategies that were found to be effective in addressing student behavioral problems in schools. The strategies included receiving adult praise, having individual and group reinforcement, student social skills training, and the students’ behavioral infractions being linked to them having a punishment. Along with these strategies, there are various theories that examine the delinquent human behavior. Individuals have a free will to choose their behavior, according to Siegel and Senna (1994). Deviant behavior can be motivated by personal needs and would cease if the potential pain associated with a behavior outweighed its anticipated gain. Siegel and Senna (1994) added that if a behavior is reinforced by some positive reaction or action, it is likely to continue and eventually be learned.

There are many theories of personalities used when studying human behavior. Melton (2001) agreed that such theories as the contemporary trait theory and the psychodynamic theory are based on the ideas of physical conditions at birth and the family’s role during childhood. Similarly, the behavioral theory is the idea that individuals learn by observing how people react to their behavior. The social learning theory contends that a person’s learning and social experiences, coupled with his or her values and expectations, determine behavior (Melton, 2001). Finally, The Gottfredson

and Hirsch Theory, a low self-control theory holding that children early on develop levels of self-control, is mentioned by Melton (2001). Melton (2001) reported the theory suggests that delinquent behavior offers benefits to the potential offenders. According to research by Gibbs, Giever, and Martin (1998) related to The Gottfredson and Hirsch Theory, the culture of the students' surroundings or their basic disposition or nature influence how they will behave.

Schools can promote good conduct through programs such as in-school suspension that teach character education. Work done by the Character Educational Partnership (2010), reported that schools can improve students' intellectual, social, emotional, and ethical development to help the youngsters become more responsible and caring individuals. This type of approach is a partnership between the schools, parents, and community to help improve their children's development (Character Educational Partnership, 2010).

According to information provided by Ripple Effects (2011), an intervention designed for students in ISS and detention, students could have underlying risk factors giving the perception of student misconduct. These issues could include problems such as communicative disorders, dyslexia, mobility impairments, emotional and behavioral disorders, attention problems, and English language learners. Each of these offers its own challenges that must be met in the regular classroom as well as by the in-school suspension instructors. Teachers and administrators must recognize the components of behavioral problems and understand the individual factors that are not necessarily related to misconduct that could be perceived as the student being a behavioral problem (Ripple Effects, 2011).

An organized and structured in-school suspension program can be successful. A study by Guindon (1992) implemented an in-school suspension program in an elementary school for four months and found that the program objectives were met, student grades did not drop, counseling was provided to students, parents were notified, and 14 of the 19 students suspended to in-school suspension returned to their regular classroom with no problems.

The Principal's Role

As mentioned earlier, schools face a serious problem when dealing with student discipline. It is rarely disputed among experts that today's schools need to be safe and secure places of learning and the students' needs should be a priority for all school principals (MacNeil & Prater, 2000). There were five ingredients that Garibaldi (1979) listed for successful implementation of an in-school suspension program. They included qualified staffing, faculty support, a team approach to problem solving, respect for the student, and, most importantly, administrative involvement (Garibaldi, 1979).

The principal or school administrator must provide a safe and orderly learning environment for the staff and students. According to Morrison et al. (2001), it is their responsibility to ensure the safety of all students while at the same time caring for the individual academic and behavioral needs of the students outside the norm.

Experience is a great teacher, and the school business is no different. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2009), about 36% of public secondary school principals had three or fewer years' experience as a principal in the 2007–2008 school years. The report suggested that when a building principal lacks experience in handling discipline, it could be perceived as a concern. School discipline is established

with strong leadership from the principal. According to Gausted (1992), principals of well-disciplined students are usually highly visible models. They are constantly walking around, greeting students and teachers, and informally monitoring possible problem areas. The previous actions are also referred to by educational researcher Daniel Duke (1989), as managing the schools by walking around or being visible. There must be willingness to impose discipline and a caring attitude displayed by the principals; they are usually liked and respected, rather than feared (Gausted, 1992).

Depending on the school and district, there may be a limited amount of resources and disciplinary options available to the administrator and staff. Sisco (2010) recommended that school administrators keep in mind that using exclusionary measures such as in-school suspension should only be used after less restrictive strategies have proven unsuccessful or when student behaviors could result in injury to self or others. It is the responsibility of the administrative team to allow teachers the opportunity to receive training regarding appropriate behavioral management, skills in de-escalating problem situations, and social skill building in the primary classroom environment (Sisco, 2010).

A study by MacNeil and Prater (2000) comparing the degree to which teachers and principals agree on the seriousness of various discipline problems found that principals viewed more problems as minor or not a problem than teachers. Of the 11 issues covered in the study, the principals rated only three — absenteeism, tardiness, and physical conflict — as serious. Teachers, on the other hand, rated eight of the problems as moderately serious to serious. These data suggested to the authors that the teachers

having more direct contact with the students are more impacted by their problems (MacNeil & Prater, 2000).

According to Peterson (2009), various problems exist with current school discipline codes, limited discipline options, along with the punitive rather than educational policies and systems are in place. Administrators can take an active role and begin to change these systems to better reflect the goals of the school and better meet the needs of students. In changing the discipline code and using a broader set of consequences, administrators can also establish more support in their building (Peterson, 2009).

Mizell (1978) generalized in an article on designing and implementing a successful in-school suspension program that no matter what educational program may be in order, its success depends on the commitment and leadership of the members implementing the program. With this said, principals and school leaders play a constant and important role in the success of in-school suspension. This suggests that the principal's part in running an effective in-school suspension program is very important and that his or her staff needs to be fully supportive of the in-school suspension program for it to be successful (Mizell, 1978).

A report by Short (1988) agreed that the principal should seek faculty input when determining the purpose of the in-school suspension program and when evaluating or making changes to the program. There are many steps that administrators can take to ensure that teachers buy into the schools in-school suspension program (Short, 1988). A few important steps, according to Cummings (2009), include the administrator taking

time to explain the program, its integrity and benefits and assisting teachers in getting work delivered to the students.

The Teacher's Role

Teachers have a tremendous power to inspire and encourage students, to become strong role models, and to make a decisive difference in students' lives. However, according to Spitalli (2005), teachers also have the power to alienate students.

Teachers must understand that when a student is away from the classroom he or she missing important instruction. There are times when a teacher may have a behavioral problem in class and is not trained to effectively handle the issue (Spitalli, 2005).

Flanagain (2007) agreed that teachers are responsible for most disciplinary referrals and that training is necessary in effective classroom management. Additionally, there is a need for proper training not only in effective classroom management but also in the consistency of discipline, reducing unnecessary exclusions, and preventing the student's perception that suspension is no longer a deterrent.

According to Sacharow (2010), many educators may not have the skills they need in the classroom to deal with the youngster who talks back or the one who constantly interrupts a lecture or discussion. It is this lack of skill that prompts a teacher to eject a student from the room or send him or her to the principal's office rather than using the incident as a teachable moment. The teacher's disposition plays a tremendous role in these types of situations (Sacharow, 2010). According to a study by Morgan (1991), a population of students listed as a concern the teacher's mood and attitude as having a large impact on their suspension and handling of discipline issues.

Classroom management issues are not new to the teaching profession. In a nationwide study of public school teachers, Mansfield et al. (1991) observed that 44% of teachers reported that student misbehavior interfered with their attempts to teach their material on a daily basis. On the same note, according to an analysis performed by Wang, Haertal, and Walberg (1993), factors influencing student learning most were the teachers' skills in their ability to manage student behavior. The study discussed the positive outcomes from both the social and academic relationship of the teacher and student. The authors suggested that the quality of the social interaction will promote appropriate behavior and a strategy such as good questioning will improve classroom management (Wang et al., 1993).

According to a 2004 national survey of teachers, 76% of teachers indicated that they would be able to educate students better if there were less discipline problems (Mississippi Youth Justice Court, 2010). This again was a big reason for teachers leaving the field. This low rate of retention and the loss of experienced teachers will likely damage the schools' overall performance. According to work done by Blomberg (2004), there is a consensus that discipline is an issue and the school staff plays an important role in its regulation. School administrators and the teachers play an important role in the process of classroom management; and providing a safe, supportive, and focused classroom is a top concern of everyone involved in the field of education (Blomberg, 2004).

Chao (n.d.), in work exploring classroom behavior and social skills, noted that teachers should play a major role in the effort to reduce out-of-school suspension. The

first line of prevention is in the well-managed classroom. Teachers can use different reinforcement to increase appropriate behavior. Some most common techniques, according to Chao (n.d.), are:

1. Students provide self-reinforcement.
2. Student evaluates his or her own behavior.
3. Adult approval - Teacher and parents provides verbal recognition of student's appropriate behavior.
4. Peer recognition - Peer demonstrated recognizing student behavior.
5. Privileges - Student are awarded after demonstrating appropriate behavior.
6. Activities - Student are allow to perform an activities as a reward.
7. Tokens - Items that can be exchanged for something value.
8. Tangibles - Objects students can get by using their rewarded tokens.
9. Consumables - Rewards that students can eat. (p. 1)

Marzano (2003) stated that rules and procedures simply lessen the chance for disruption and violence. When confronting a student who is misbehaving, the teacher needs to be clear with descriptions of what the student is supposed to do. A teacher who makes good use of this technique will focus the child's attention first on the behavior he or she wants, not on the misbehavior (Chao, n.d.).

Classroom management that is characterized by strong structure, clear and consistently enforced rules, teacher monitoring, and constant feedback has a positive effect on student achievement and in preventing student misbehavior (Cotton & Savard, 1982). Good classroom management, explained by Metzger (2004), consists of organizing and keeping a classroom environment that is favorable to learning. Classroom

management entails the organization of the classroom, grouping students for learning activities, effective communication, managing student behavior, and disciplining students (Metzger, 2004).

After all options have been explored and nothing seems to work, the referral process becomes imminent. According to Garibaldi (1979), all stakeholders, teachers, administrators, counselors, and parents should have the opportunity to refer students to in-school suspension. The referral process is a form of communication and should be used as an intervention. If all personnel have access to the in-school suspension program, they will be more likely to support it fully. However, according to First and Mizell (1980), there should be a designated administrator responsible for determining if the assignment of in-school suspension is the appropriate consequence for the misbehavior.

When students are in trouble, Sisco (2010) recommended that the teacher fully explain to the student the behavior that has caused the student to be removed from the classroom. Sisco (2010) also recommended that the teacher make sure there is work for the student to complete while he or she is assigned to in-school suspension. According to Sisco (2010),

Students need to come to the ISS room with academic work to complete. As much as possible, work assigned should mirror that of the work and instruction students would receive in the regular classroom setting and not be last minute “busy work” a teacher sends just to give the student something to do. (p. 5)

A very important key to the academic success of the student referred to in-school suspension is getting input and assignments from the classroom teacher (Advantage Press, 2010). The Advantage Press (2010) suggested that in-school suspension programs

should be designed to provide a setting for the student to work on current and purposeful assignments in a monitored environment. Short (1988) stated that teachers must be notified when one of their students has been referred to in-school suspension. Teachers should also have a mechanism for receiving feedback on the work done by the student on the program as a whole (Short, 1988).

Impact of School Culture and Climate

It is an ongoing belief by many that school culture and school climate have a direct effect on student achievement and behavior. Huang (1995) in a paper concerning the environments of schools, found that in addition to teacher perspectives, research has inferred that a good school environment is linked with student achievement and that academic achievement is strongly affected by school culture. Ramsey (1994), in his guide on school discipline, agreed that healthy and productive student behavior is more about the organization's beliefs than about rules, procedures, or punishment. The school climate and culture are important to how the effective the school will be.

Deal and Peterson (1990) defined organizational climate as the collective personality of the school, based upon an atmosphere distinguished by the personal, social, and professional interactions of those individuals within a school. Factors that impact climate include leadership, classroom instruction, classroom management, physical surroundings, and the nature and tone of the relationships therein (Deal & Peterson, 1990).

Schools with high suspension rates typically have high student-teacher ratios, low academic quality ratings, administrative indifference to school climate, a disproportionate

amount of time spent on reactive discipline, and ineffective school governance (Advocates For Children & Youth, 2006).

School climate and culture are two distinct dimensions in a school. The following is a description of school culture and climate (Tableman, 2004):

The terms school culture and school climate describe the environment that affects the behavior of teachers and students. School culture is the shared beliefs and attitudes that characterize the district-wide organization and establish boundaries for its constituent units. School climate characterizes the organization at the school building and classroom level. It refers to the “feel” of a school and can vary from school to school within the same district. While an individual school can develop a climate independently of the larger organization, changes in school culture at the district level can positively or adversely affect school climate at the building level. (p. 1)

As early as the 1980s, research showed the positive results of the effects that schools had on behavior. According to Embry (1997), previous studies have found that: (a) praise for work in the classroom at led to better student behavior; (b) increased awards were associated with improved behavior; (c) better behavior came about when students were given responsibility; (d) completed homework was linked to improved behavior and achievement; (e) standards of behavior were effective in maintaining a positive school climate; and (f) frequent interaction between students and teachers concerning academic issues helped to develop positive behavior and improved achievement. These findings led to the belief that keeping students in a positive school environment will improve their behavior and academic achievement (Embry, 1997).

Huang (1995) mentioned that teachers must use solid instructional strategies to keep the attention and control of their class. These instructional strategies and practices can be an important variable in changing student behavior and performance (Huang, 1995). In this study, Huang (1995) compared low-performing and high-performing schools, finding evidence that teachers in high-performing schools used critical thinking and effective teaching and learning strategies more than at the lower-performing schools.

The school climate and culture have a definite impact on student discipline and achievement. Robert Marzano (2000) found in an analysis of the 10 most visible studies on school effectiveness conducted between 1966 and 1997 that, on average, schools account for 20% of the variance in student achievement. The importance of schools putting an emphasis on the beliefs and values that set the organization's standard for expected student behaviors was noted by Tableman (2004). These data supported the belief that schools and their characteristics do impact student performance. The success of an in-school suspension program on changing student behaviors and the students' achievement at any school will depend on the perception, acceptance, and cooperation of the entire staff.

Summary

This review of literature investigated different types of school discipline and focused on the effects of in-school suspension on the student's academic achievement and behavior. There were many variables that were explored such as the principal's and teacher's role in discipline, along with the effect of the overall school culture and climate. In this era of accountability, educators must look into each and every possibility to improve on the discipline efforts in schools.

As the literature noted, there are many models of in-school suspension, and researchers agree that an in-school suspension program can be effective in changing student behavior, along with serving as a good alternative to excluding students from school. This review of literature has shown that student behavior may be affected by many variables and is somewhat unpredictable. Mendez and Sanders (1981) argued that in-school suspension could be a viable and beneficial tool if equal attention is given to rehabilitation, order, and control. However, they suggested that if it is considered just an administrative convenience for discipline, it will probably provide no educational benefit and may even have a negative overall effect (Mendez & Sanders, 1981).

This literature review recognized the importance of strong leadership and total collaboration with all stakeholders when managing an effective in-school suspension program. Teachers and staff should be kept up to date with the students who are being assigned in-school suspension and have a role in the program's design. It is evident from the information discovered in this review that the overall success of in-school suspension, as with any school program, rests on the shoulders of the leader and facilitators of the program.

An effective in-school suspension must be designed with strong rules and procedures, along with on-going evaluation. According to this review, the program is most effective when it has a supervisor who is firm, a set of rules that promote task-oriented behavior, and a process where administrators and teachers establish the activities for the students to perform.

Finally, there seems to be no significant literature that demonstrates one way or another the effectiveness of in-school suspension. In many cases, school-wide strategies

are being used to improve the overall environment of the school. It is agreed that students learn best when they are in an educational environment. As mentioned earlier, there are many variables that must be present and working for an in-school suspension program to be effective in helping students. This review provided information on the effectiveness on various discipline strategies and explored many areas that are related to the student's behavior and the strategies that may be used to improve the student's behavior and academic achievement.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to examine the perceptions of school personnel, including teachers, ISS staff, and administrators, concerning the effectiveness of their in-school suspension program in changing student behavior and improving student academic success as perceived by the faculty and administration. Data were collected at high schools of various sizes located mainly in the central region of Mississippi. These schools were chosen based on their geographic location and proximity to the researcher. Schools differed on several variables including student performance on statewide tests, as indicated by their state accreditation level, and other variables such as absenteeism, percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, number of school suspensions, and drop-out rates. State accreditation levels of the schools included in this study were Star (19%), High Performing (19%), Successful (28%), Low Performing (3%), Academic Watch (28%), and Failing (3%). There were no schools in the surveyed area that qualified as an At-Risk of Failing School. According to the Mississippi Department of Education (2011), the accountability model measures student performance on more rigorous curriculum and assessments. Table 1 represents the school results of the 2010 state accountability model, according to the Mississippi Department of Education (2011).

Table 1

School Results of the 2010 Mississippi Accountability Model

Label	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
School Accountability Results		
Star	53	6%
High Performing	168	20%
Successful	252	31%
Academic Watch	187	23%
Low Performing	2	<1%
At Risk of Failing	129	16%
Failing	29	4%

For accountability purposes, the Mississippi State Board of Education may also take into account such factors as graduation rates, dropout rates, completion rates, growth of students, and the extent to which the school or district employs qualified teachers in every classroom. Under the accountability model, schools and districts receive the following performance classification levels: Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing. These levels serve as an evaluative and improvement tool for both local district and state use. To evaluate these perceptions, a questionnaire was given to school personnel including the administrators, ISS staff, and teachers.

Research Design

Differences in perception among teachers, ISS staff, and administrators, of the ISS programs were assessed between three performance groups. The high performance level group included Star and High Performing schools (38%). The medium performance level group included Successful schools (28%). Finally, the low performance level group included schools identified as Academic Watch, Low Performing, and Failing (34%). There were no schools in the surveyed area that qualified as an At-Risk of Failing School. Differences in ISS effectiveness, purpose, ISS staff qualifications, and communication between teachers and ISS staff were determined as well as whether a relationship existed between the school performance level and the perceptions of ISS among school staff including administrators, ISS staff, and teachers.

Participants

The subjects in this study included teachers, ISS staff, and administrators from various schools inside numerous school districts across the central region of Mississippi. The participants within the schools chosen for the study represent six of the seven performance level groups identified by the state. These participants and schools were chosen according to their geographic location and proximity to the researcher. There were no At-Risk of Failing schools located in the school districts that were surveyed. The levels of the possible schools included in this study are Star (19%), High Performing (19%), Successful (28%), Low Performing (3%), Academic Watch (28%), and Failing (3%). Personal information such as gender, length of time in field of education, and current position held was collected from each respondent.

Instrumentation

A 15-item in-school suspension survey assessing ISS perception was distributed to all teachers, ISS staff, and administrators (Appendix A). Dr. David Whitfield developed the questionnaire that was used and gave written permission to use this instrument (Appendix B). According to Whitfield and Bulach (1996), the questionnaire was developed to measure ISS conditions, effectiveness, and philosophical orientation. Responses to questionnaire items were obtained on a five-point Likert-type scale with anchors consisting of *Strongly Agree*, *Agree*, *Not Applicable*, *Disagree*, and *Strongly Disagree*. To ensure consistency in the respondent's ratings, Whitfield and Bulach (1996) explained that some statements containing similar concepts were stated from opposite or reversed views.

Reliability for the questionnaire was established through test-retest procedures. The Pearson's correlation coefficient for the survey showed .97 reliability values. Validity of the content was established by having several experts in the area of student personnel and survey research critique the questionnaire (Whitfield & Bulach, 1996).

The instrument also included a section to gather personal information such as gender, length of time in field of education, and current position held. Additionally, the school accreditation level was identified for each respondent. This was accomplished by the numbering arrangement of questions to match accreditation level.

Procedures

The entire teaching faculty, administration, and ISS staffs of the participating schools were asked to complete and return the ISS survey. With the written permission of each school district's superintendent, the questionnaires were sent to each

participant either by mail or delivered in person with permission from the building level principal. The questionnaire packets consisted of several elements. There was an introductory letter explaining the importance of the study and asking the teachers' and principals' cooperation with instructions for completing the questionnaire. A statement of approval confirmation from the superintendent was also included in the cover letter. A consent letter was included inside the packet to explain the purpose, time constraints, risks, and privacy explanations along with other generalities about the study. Participants had the option of responding in pencil or ink on the questionnaire. Lastly, a self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope was included to help with the return responses in order that the questionnaire was completed and returned by the due date. If for any reason the study did not receive the amount of participation necessary, with the permission of the building principal, the researcher planned to personally visit the school and collect the data during a faculty meeting or teacher planning blocks.

The questionnaires contained an area for the respondents to indicate if they were a classroom teacher, ISS teacher/director, or administrator. The indicators of position helped the researcher to ensure that the staff members were represented correctly. The participant response documents were counted as each envelope was received. Responses to rated questions for the faculty, ISS staff, and administrator's questionnaires were calculated and the results illustrated in the researcher's findings. Permission was obtained from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) to use the outlined procedures and the data collected for this study (Appendix C).

Data Analysis

The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed as follows. Items 1, 2, 3, 9*, 11, and 15 are grouped together to address the degree of program effectiveness. Items 4, 5, 6*, and 7 measured the staff's perception of the purpose of the ISS program. These items focused on the academic assistance and counseling services being provided to the students assigned to ISS. Questions 9 and 6 with an asterisk are reverse coded. Items 8 and 14 on the questionnaire examined the staff's perceptions dealing with the qualifications of the ISS staff in managing the ISS program. Finally, items 10, 12, and 13 addressed the issue of the staff's perception of the communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff (Whitfield & Bulach, 1996). A one-way ANOVA test procedure was used to respond to the research questions.

Limitations

There were limitations to this study. All school districts in the area were not surveyed. There were districts that did not respond to the researcher's request and were not included in the study. There was no school in the districts surveyed that had the performance level of at risk of failing. Only administrators, ISS staff, and teachers were selected for the study; thus, the sample is from a limited population.

Summary

The perception of school personnel, including teachers, ISS staff, and administrators, concerning the effectiveness of their in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and improving students' academic success were discussed. The one-way ANOVA testing procedure was used to measure the difference in perception of the performance level groups surveyed.

For this study, the researcher used data obtained from the participants to determine differences in ISS effectiveness, purpose, ISS staff qualifications, and communication and whether a relationship existed between the school level and the perceptions of ISS among school staff including the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators.

The researcher was given permission to use a survey tool that had already been developed. The questionnaire assessing ISS perception included 15 questions, and responses were obtained on a five-point Likert-type scale with anchors consisting of *Strongly Agree, Agree, Not Applicable, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree*. Reliability for the questionnaire was established through test-retest procedures.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing student behavior and improving student academic success at various schools with different performance levels, as perceived by the schools' personnel including their teachers, ISS staff, and administration.

By investigating the relationship between in-school suspension programs and the higher academic success of schools, the researcher sought to develop information that can be used to strengthen the instructional and disciplinary process. The benefits will be in future ISS program implementation, effectiveness of the programs, and the structure and goals of future programs.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and students' academic success at various schools with different performance labels, as perceived by the schools' personnel including the teachers, ISS staff, and administration. This was done through examining data obtained from the participants regarding their perceptions of ISS effectiveness, purpose, ISS staff qualifications, and communication between teachers and ISS staff. The study determined whether a relationship existed between the school performance level and the perceptions of ISS among school staff including the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators.

The following individuals from school districts located in the central region of Mississippi were surveyed during the spring semester of 2012: teachers, administrators, and ISS staff. These participants were selected because they all have some knowledge of how the ISS program works in their schools, and they come into contact with students who are likely to serve in ISS. The data were analyzed using SPSS.

Of the 1,726 questionnaires that were sent out for completion, 724 (41.9%) were returned. These returned questionnaires were used for analysis purposes.

Sample Characteristics

The participants in this study included teachers, ISS staff, and administrators. The vast majority of responses (89%) were received from teachers. The administrators made up the next largest group, while the ISS staff had the fewest respondents.

The researcher analyzed gender and years of experience of respondents. The majority of the respondents in this study were female, making up 64.9% of the participants. The researcher found that the majority of respondents had one to five years of experience. The next largest group had six to 10 years of experience. The groups with 11 to 15, 26+, and 16 to 20 years of experience were somewhat even, while the least number of respondents indicated that they had 21 to 25 years of experience. Table 2 contains information about the participant roles in their school, gender, and years of experience.

Table 2

Roles in School, Gender, and Years of Experience

	n	Percentage
Role		
Teacher	644	89%
Administrator	64	8.8%
ISS Staff	16	2.2%
Gender		
Female	470	64.9%
Male	253	34.9%
Years of Experience		
1 to 5 years	176	24.3%
6 to 10 years	152	21.0%
11 to 15 years	126	17.4%
16 to 20 years	100	13.8%

Table 2 (continued).

	n	Percentage
Years of Experience		
21 to 25 years	65	9.0%
26 + years	104	14.4%

Differences in perception of the ISS programs were assessed for the high performance level group (38%, Star and High Performing), the medium performance level group (28%, Successful), and the low-performance level group (34%, Academic Watch, Low Performing, and Failing). The majority of the respondents in this study came from schools with performance levels of Star and High Performing. Slightly less than half (47.9%) of the overall participants were represented from this high performance level group. Schools labeled as Academic Watch, Low Performing, and Failing were the next largest to respond, while Successful schools were the fewest to respond of the three categories. The previous two performance level categories were fairly equal in their overall participation. The researcher analyzed the number of Title I and non-title schools. Title I schools participate in a federal program determined by their having a high percentage of students that are eligible for free and reduced lunch. There were more respondents from Title I schools (58%) than non-title schools (Table 3).

Table 3

School's Performance Level and Title Status

	n	Percentage
Performance Level		
Star/High Performing	347	47.9%
Successful	185	25.6%
Academic Watch/Low Performing/Failing	192	26.5%
Title Status		
Title I	420	58%
Non-Title	304	42%

Item Descriptives

The researcher analyzed the perceptions of teachers, administrators, and ISS staff through information gathered from a questionnaire. The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed as follows: Items 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, and 15 were used to address the degree of program effectiveness (Table 4). Items 4, 5, 6, and 7 measured the perception of the purpose of the ISS program (Table 5). Items 8 and 14 examined the perceptions dealing with the qualifications of the ISS staff (Table 6). Finally, items 10, 12, and 13 addressed the perception of the communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff (Table 7). The following tables provide information gathered from all returned questionnaires concerning participant responses to ISS. This includes teachers, administrators, and ISS staff from all performance levels.

Table 4

*Teacher, Administrator, ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Program Effectiveness
(All Performance Levels)*

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation
1 ISS is effective method of solving problems	3.18	.90
2 Students are less likely to be disruptive after ISS	3.02	.87
3 ISS is more effective than after-school detention	3.03	.97
9 ISS is a waste of time and money*	3.18	.97
11 Students return to class with improved attitude	2.96	.83
15 Overall, ISS is effective	3.05	.92

Note, Scale: 5 (*Strongly Agree*)....2 (*Strongly Disagree*)

* Question 9 was reverse coded.

Table 5

Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Program Purpose (All Performance Levels)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation
4 Students receive academic assistance in ISS	3.21	1.00
5 Students receive counseling in ISS	2.88	.89
6 Main purpose of ISS should be punitive*	3.69	1.04
7 Main purpose of ISS should be academic	2.91	.93

Note, Scale: 5 (*Strongly Agree*)....2 (*Strongly Disagree*)

* Question 6 was reverse coded.

Table 6

Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Staff Qualifications (All Performance Levels)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation
8 Certified teacher should be in charge	3.85	.98
14 ISS staff is well qualified	3.36	1.03

Note, Scale: 5 (*Strongly Agree*)....2 (*Strongly Disagree*)

Table 7

Teacher, Administrator, and ISS Staff Responses Concerning ISS Staff and Classroom Teacher Communication (All Performance Levels)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation
10 Teachers are informed about student improvement	2.58	.74
12 ISS teacher communicates to regular teacher	2.88	.93
13 ISS and classroom teacher discuss assignments	2.76	.85

Note, Scale: 5 (*Strongly Agree*)....2 (*Strongly Disagree*)

The researcher analyzed the overall perception of the teachers, administrators, and ISS staff in all schools surveyed. The constructs used on the questionnaire range from 2 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*) or 1(*Not Applicable*). The majority of the means of the items concerning all respondents surveyed fell between 2.6 and 3.2 that was in the range of *Strongly Disagree* and *Disagree*. With a mean of just under 4, more participants than not felt that the main purpose of ISS should be to punish students and

that a certified teacher should be in charge of ISS. Means of around 3 indicated that overall respondents were uncertain or disagreed that ISS was an effective method of solving discipline problems, the ISS staff was well qualified, ISS is a waste of the school's time and money, students assigned to ISS are less likely to be disruptive after they return to the classroom, students have an improved attitude after time in ISS, and the overall ISS program was effective at their school. With a mean of just above 2, it was evident that the participants disagreed that teachers were informed about improvement in students' behavior after placement in ISS, students receive counseling in ISS, and teachers and ISS staff discuss student assignments before and after placement in ISS.

Statistical Data

This study examined the differences in teacher, administrator, and ISS staff perceptions of the ISS programs inside of three performance level groupings of schools. The performance level groups included Star and High Performing (High), Successful (Medium), and Academic Watch, Low Performing, and Failing (Low). Research question 1 asked: Is there a difference in the way teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the effectiveness of the ISS programs in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? The participants gave responses in order for the researcher to answer that question. Items 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, and 15 were used to address the degree of program effectiveness (Table 8). According to the data recorded for research question 1, the results of the one-way ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference, $F(2,721) = 4.56, p = .011$, between the performance level groups and their perception of the effectiveness of ISS. Both the high and medium

performance levels perceived that the ISS programs were more effective than the low performance levels. Question 1 on the survey asked if ISS was an effective method of solving problems. According to the mean scores of slightly above 3, both the high and medium performance levels agreed more strongly that ISS was more effective than the low performing levels. The high performance level group perceived more strongly that students were less likely to be disruptive after being assigned ISS, with the low performance level group disagreeing more often with this statement. The medium performance level group held more often than the other performance groups that ISS was a more effective discipline tool than after-school detention. The mean scores did indicate more often that participants in all categories disagreed that ISS was an effective discipline tool. However, both the high and medium performing groups more often than the low performing group felt that it was an effective means of discipline.

Research question 2 asked: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive a difference in the desired purpose of the ISS program as being therapeutic, academic, or punitive in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? Items 4, 5, 6, and 7 measured the perception of the purpose of the ISS program (Table 8). The results of the one-way ANOVA indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among the three performance level groups and their perception of the purpose of ISS, $F(2,721) = 19.53, p < .001$. The Tukey Post Hoc tests showed that the high performance level group ($M = 2.95, SD = .58$) significantly differed in their perception of the purpose of ISS from the medium performance level group ($M = 3.27, SD = .63$) and the low performance level group ($M = 3.15, SD = .56$). Further,

there was no statistically significant difference in the medium and the low performance level groups' perception.

All performance groups indicated that the main purpose of the ISS program should be more punitive in nature. The high performance level groups' mean was just under 4, indicating that they agree more with the punitive model than both the medium and low performing groups. With a mean of greater than 3, the medium performance level group of participants perceived that there should be more academic assistance provided than both the high and low performance level groups of participants. The low performance level group agreed more often that students should receive counseling during their ISS stay than both the high and medium performance groups. Although all groups indicated that the main purpose of ISS should be punitive; they were not in total agreement of the use of academic assistance and counseling inside the ISS program.

Research question 3 asked: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the ISS staff as qualified to properly manage the ISS programs in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? Items 8 and 14 examined the perceptions dealing with the qualifications of the ISS staff (Table 8). The results of the one-way ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference, $F(2,715) = 30.50, p < .001$, between the performance level groups and their perception of the qualifications of the ISS staff. The groups did not agree that the ISS staff in their school was well qualified to conduct the ISS program. The Tukey Post Hoc tests showed that the medium performance level group ($M = 3.95, SD = .73$) significantly differed in their opinion of the ISS staff's qualifications from the high performance level

group ($M = 3.48$, $SD = .62$) and the low performance level group ($M = 3.59$, $SD = .70$). There was no significant difference in the high and low performance groups. All groups agreed, with a mean above 3, that a certified teacher should be in charge of ISS. With a mean above 4, the medium performance level group agreed a strongly that their ISS program should be administered by a certified teacher. The low and high performing groups, with a mean of just above 3, disagreed that their ISS staff was well qualified, while the medium performance level group indicated more often that their ISS staff was well qualified for running the program. Overall, all performance level groups perceived strongly that having a qualified staff is important for the ISS program to be successful. All groups indicated, more than not, that there should be a qualified staff member in charge of the ISS program. The low performing group pointing out that their ISS staff was least qualified.

Research question 4 asked: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive that there is proper communication between the teachers and the ISS staff in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? Items 10, 12, and 13 addressed the perception of the communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff (Table 8). According to the results of the one-way ANOVA, a statistically significant difference, $F(2,701) = 17.27$, $p < .001$, is indicated between the performance level groups and their perception of the communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff. All performance level groups agreed that teachers were rarely informed about student improvement in ISS, although, the Tukey Post Hoc tests showed the medium performance level group ($M = 3.02$, $SD = .84$) significantly

differed in their opinion of communication between the ISS staff and the regular staff, from the high performance level group ($M = 2.70$, $SD = .69$) and the low performance level group ($M = 2.61$, $SD = .66$). There was no significant difference in the high and low performance level groups. The medium performance level group held that more often teachers are informed of students' progress from ISS staff. The high and low performance level groups, with means of just above 2.5, were similar in their agreement that the ISS staff did not regularly inform the classroom teachers of students' progress during ISS assignments. Lastly, both the high and low performance level groups agreed that teachers and ISS staff do not discuss student assignments before and after placement in ISS, although, the medium performance group, with a mean of fewer than 3, perceived more strongly that there was some discussion of the students' assignment between ISS staff and teachers.

Table 8 indicates the relationship between the performance level groups and the effectiveness, purpose, communication efforts, and staff qualifications in their ISS programs. With the performance groups' mean scores falling between 3.04 and 3.29 in their overall perception of the ISS programs, it is evident that they disagree that the ISS program works in their school (Table 8).

Table 8

Relationship Between Performance Groups for Perception of In-School Suspension

Performance Level	Mean	Standard Deviation
High (Star/High Performing)		
Program Effectiveness	3.25	.70
Purpose	2.95	.58

Table 8 (continued).

Performance Level	Mean	Standard Deviation
High (Star/High Performing)		
Qualifications	3.48	.62
Communication	2.70	.69
Total Perception	3.09	.51
Medium (Successful)		
Program Effectiveness	3.23	.72
Purpose	3.27	.63
Qualifications	3.95	.73
Communication	3.02	.84
Total Perception	3.29	.56
Low (Academic Watch/Low Performing, Failing)		
Program Effectiveness	3.07	.68
Purpose	3.15	.56
Qualifications	3.59	.70
Communication	2.61	.66
Total Perception	3.04	.47

Summary

The questionnaire provided the researcher with personal information about the respondents, along with their perceptions of ISS. The researcher surveyed more teachers than both administrators and ISS staff, and, as expected, most of the respondents were

teachers. Most of the responses came from females with one to five years of experience. Also, the higher number of returned questionnaires came from Star and High Performing (high performance level group) along with Title I schools.

The results from the questionnaire revealed that the respondents perceived that, overall, ISS is ineffective in their school setting. For the most part, the performance level groups agreed that the purpose of ISS should be punitive in nature, but there was a significant difference in the use of academic assistance and counseling inside the ISS program. There was significant difference in the performance level groups opinions of their schools ISS staffs' qualifications. The performance level groups did not agree that the ISS staff in their school was well qualified to conduct the ISS program; however, they did agree more often than not that there should be a certified teacher in charge of ISS. Finally, there was a significant difference in the performance level groups opinion of how well the staffs communicated with each other about ISS. The medium performance level group was convinced that more often teachers are informed of the students' progress from ISS staff. On the other hand, all of the performance groups agreed that teachers were rarely informed about student improvement in ISS.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study was performed to examine the perceptions of teachers, ISS staff, and administrators on the effectiveness of the in-school suspension program in changing students' behavior and their academic success at various schools across the central region of Mississippi with different performance levels. This was done through examining data obtained from the participants regarding their perceptions of ISS effectiveness, purpose, ISS staff qualifications, and communication between teachers and ISS staff. During the spring semester of 2012 data were collected using a questionnaire to determine whether a relationship existed between the school performance level and the perceptions of ISS among school staff, including the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators. The data were then analyzed using SPSS and the following results were yielded.

Conclusion and Discussion

In the previous chapter, the researcher presented the data gathered from the ISS staff survey collected during the spring of 2012. The study focused on four research questions regarding ISS at various schools across the central region of Mississippi in order to determine the differences that exist among the schools with differing performance levels. The research questions focused on teacher, administrator, and ISS staff perceptions of ISS effectiveness, purpose, ISS staff qualifications, and communication between teachers and ISS staff.

The first research question was as follows: Is there a difference in the way teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the effectiveness of the ISS programs in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? The results of the questionnaire did show variances between the performance level groups, including some that were diverse pertaining to the effectiveness of ISS. Unlike Gootman (1998), suggesting that ISS could be used effectively to reduce student misbehavior, the results of the questionnaire revealed that participants in all performance categories agreed that ISS was ineffective, although, more often than not, participants disagreed that ISS was a waste of time and money. This indicated that most participants perceived that ISS was needed in their schools. ISS staff in this study perceived that ISS was working more so than administrators and teachers. The results in this study agreed with Di Lullo's (2004) study that found in-school suspension may not be an effective or efficient type of discipline. The high performance level group perceived more strongly that students were less likely to be disruptive after being assigned ISS, with the low performance level group disagreeing more often with this statement. The medium performance level group held more often than the other performance groups that ISS was a more effective discipline tool than after-school detention. The responses from the participants in this study were consistent with the faculty responses in a similar study on ISS by Whitfield and Bulach (1996) that students do not return to class with improved attitudes.

The second research question was: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive a difference in the desired purpose of the ISS program as being therapeutic, academic, or punitive in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic

Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? The study found a significant difference in the performance level groups' opinions of the purpose of ISS. The performance level groups agreed that the ISS program should be comprised of more than just one purpose. They agreed in part with Peterson (2005), who stated that a good in-school suspension program should include academic tutoring, instruction on skill building related to the student behavior problem, and the students' progress or behavior while serving in the program. Although all performance level groups perceived that the main purpose of ISS should be punitive, they were not in total agreement of the use of academic assistance and counseling inside the ISS program. Participants in the high performance level group indicated that they agreed more with the punitive model than both the medium and low performance level groups. The medium performance level group of participants agreed with Sheets (1996), who recommended that students assigned to in-school suspension should have the ability to get assistance and have academic learning time. They also perceived that there should be more academic assistance provided. The participants in the low performance level group agreed that more students should receive counseling during their ISS stay than both the high and medium performance level groups. Teachers acknowledged doubt that students received academic assistance while in ISS, whereas ISS staff perceived rather strongly that students were receiving academic assistance. Teachers also agreed more often than both administrators and the ISS staff that ISS should be more punitive in nature.

The third question was: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive the ISS staff as qualified to properly manage the ISS program in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and

Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? The results indicated a statistically significant difference between the performance level groups and their perception of the qualifications of the ISS staff. The performance level groups did not agree that the ISS staff in their school was well qualified to conduct the ISS program. The medium performance level group perceived significantly that their ISS staffs were more qualified than both the high and low performance level groups. The low performing group agreed more often than the other performance level groups their staff was not qualified to head up the ISS program. All performance level groups indicated that there should be a certified teacher in charge of ISS. Finally, all performance level groups pointed to the qualification of the ISS staff as making a difference in the program's effectiveness by indicating that there should be qualified staff members in charge of the ISS program. The participants agreed with Sullivan (1989) that a full-time, qualified, and well-trained staff member is vital to the success of any in-school suspension program. Overall, the researcher found that the ISS staff agreed very strongly they were well qualified to conduct in the ISS programs in their schools. However, the teachers disagreed more often with this statement.

Research question 4 was as follows: Do the teachers, ISS staff, and administrators perceive that there is proper communication between the teachers and the ISS staff in schools labeled as Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the Mississippi Accountability Label? The results indicated a statistically significant difference between the performance level groups and their perception of the communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff. All performance level groups agreed that teachers were rarely informed

about student improvement in ISS. The medium performance level group differed in their opinion of communication between the ISS staff and the regular staff, indicating that more often teachers are informed of students' progress from ISS staff. The high and low performance level groups were similar in their agreement that ISS staff did not regularly inform the classroom teachers of students' progress during ISS assignments. Lastly, both the high and low performance level groups agreed that teachers and ISS staff do not discuss student assignments before and after placement in ISS. Finally, the medium performance level group perceived more strongly that there were discussions of the students' assignment between ISS staff and teachers.

Evidence gathered by the researcher suggests the performance level groups do not perceive that ISS supports modifications in student behavioral or academic success. The findings of this study agreed with Silvey (1995) that students showed no significant difference in their academic achievement after serving in ISS and the findings by Welch (2010), which suggested that in-school suspension does not keep students from committing behavior infractions once they complete the program. The performance level groups agreed that students show very little improvement in their attitude after their stay in ISS. The performance level groups disagreed on the overall purpose of an ISS program while suggesting it should be punitive in nature. The performance level groups also agreed that there should be more qualified staff working with the students while in ISS. They perceived that a certified teacher should be in charge. Finally, all performance groups agreed that there was very little communication between the teachers and the ISS staff. Overall, the researcher found that there was no evidence, according to this study,

supporting the idea that ISS programs are more effective in schools that have attained higher performance levels.

Limitations

This study investigated school staff including teacher, administrator, and ISS staffs perception of the in-school suspension programs in a sample of schools across the central region of Mississippi with accreditation levels including Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At-Risk of Failing, and Failing, according to the current Mississippi Accountability Label. Thus, the results of the study may not be applicable to all schools throughout the United States. Because of the limited number of schools participating in the study, of the questionnaires returned, only a small portion were from ISS staff and from lower performing schools. There were no student perceptions involved in this study. The results are also limited to the time period studied during the spring of 2012.

Recommendations for Policy or Practice

Based on the results of this study, the researcher has developed recommendations for effective ISS programs. Since many of the participants feel their ISS programs are ineffective, steps should be taken to redefine the purpose, along with the policies and procedures that go along with an effective program. These rules and regulations should be in written form and posted inside the ISS classroom, along with constant monitoring. With the differences discovered inside the different level schools, the researcher recommends that each school should design its ISS program around its individual needs. Emphasis should be applied to the planning stages of ISS, along with collaboration among the faculty, administration, parents, and community. There should be faculty

meetings held that are specific to the ISS program. For ISS to be effective, there must be strong leadership from school administrators and good communication between faculty and staff, and the program must be continually monitored. Teachers should work inside their departments to ensure that students in ISS are being given the proper attention.

According to Sullivan (1989), training the stakeholders in the philosophy, objectives, and strategies of the program is essential to the program's success. The teachers and parents should play a large role in program design and the referral process. There is definitely a need for an effective in-school suspension program in the educational setting, but the policy must include clear guidelines and goals, along with a supportive staff (Chung & Paul, 1996). School leaders should define the philosophies and goals of their ISS program and use proven research-based models to improve their current ISS programs.

The researcher found that the participants in the study were unsure of the goals of their ISS program. They perceived that the ISS program should be punitive in nature; however, there was also a perception that there should be an academic and therapeutic component intertwined in the program. So many times ISS becomes an avenue used by the teacher and the administrator to simply remove the student from the classroom. For the program to be successful, this removal should be partnered with a referral to an administrator so that there can be a time for counseling and reflection. There must be an effort to remedy the problem behavior. To help accomplish a more therapeutic approach, more personnel such as counselors or interventionists should be included in the program. ISS should be temporary confinement of students that provides counseling and other assistance to aid in producing improvements in behavioral and learning motivation (Cotton & Savard, 1982). There should be a well thought out, collaborative mission for

each individual school or school district that will be followed and maintained for student success. This researcher would recommend having available a curriculum or guidelines for students and teachers to follow. ISS should be a program that students do not want to attend; it must have a punitive nature, but the ISS program should also lend itself to improvement of the students academically and behaviorally.

Participants in this study agreed that there should be qualified staff in charge of the schools' ISS program. The staff overseeing the ISS program should be firm strong disciplinarians. They should also express the ability to communicate effectively with the students while keeping them on task. The staff should be provided with adequate resources and be well trained to aid students in behavioral modifications as well as assist in their class work. Teachers throughout the school, across many disciplines, may be sending work for students to complete during their stay in ISS. With this in mind, it is vital to the success of the student academically and behaviorally that the ISS teacher has the ability to aid the student in various courses of study. A very important component of a successful ISS program in aiding the students' academic success is getting input and assignments from the classroom teacher (Advantage Press, 2010). There should be an effort by school leaders to hire not only a full-time certified teacher into the position of ISS director but also a patient person that can handle students with behavioral problems.

Communication was a key factor found to be missing, according to the participants in this study, in their current ISS programs. Administrators should take time to help the teachers understand the ISS program along with its uses and benefits. The ISS program will not be successful without the support of both the administration and the

teachers. Administrators should help create communication lines between the ISS staff and the classroom teachers. Teachers should have a mechanism for receiving feedback on the work done by the students while in ISS (Short, 1988). If a student is in ISS, the teachers should take time during their planning time to visit the student and help ensure that the student is staying on track academically. The researcher suggests that in improving ISS there should be attention given to teacher behaviors toward ISS and a focus on a more collegial relationship between the teachers and the ISS staff. According to an article by Barth (2006), relationships between adults within the school have a greater influence on the character and quality of the school and students in the school than anything else. For the ISS program to be effective, students should receive work in ISS, and the classroom teacher must get the students' work that has been completed while in ISS. Communication between the classroom teachers and the ISS staff is vital for the ISS program to be successful.

Finally, there should be an effort to remedy behavioral problems through better teacher training and school-wide behavioral programs. Teachers should be better trained in classroom management and on how to handle problems within their classrooms. It is better for the students' academic success to keep the students in the classroom. Classroom management entails the organization of the classroom, grouping students for learning activities, effective communication, managing student behavior, and disciplining students (Metzger, 2004).

The culture of the school can also lead to better student behavior. Promoting positive behavior and support throughout the entire student body can lead to less frequent behavior referrals and fewer students in ISS. School-wide behavioral programs that are

positive, consistent, regulated, and culturally sensitive are likely to enhance students' current and future academic achievements and encourage successes in the student's lives (Iselin, 2010).

Recommendations for Future Research

This study presents sufficient information and interesting responses to the original statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to provide data on the perceptions of teachers, administrators, and ISS staff at schools with differing performance levels toward their current ISS programs. Because this study was limited to schools in the central region of Mississippi, additional research could be conducted in other schools and school districts in other states to determine the effectiveness of ISS programs within various performance levels. Future steps in this study should investigate any new strategies that may have been used to improve ISS and their effect on the programs.

Future studies could focus on specific ISS programs that are being used among schools and school districts. There are many models such as punitive, academic, or therapeutic that may be used, depending on the goals of the school or school district. A major finding of this study was the importance of having counseling and academic support available to the students in ISS. Researchers agreed, that to have a change in student behavior, these components are vital.

There could also be future research done in schools that are using specific school-wide behavioral programs. In many instances, school staff may not recognize the overall goals of their ISS programs. A researcher may consider observing ISS in many different schools. This observation can help the researcher to determine activities done by the

students and identify program characteristics. Future studies may include the students' perceptions of ISS programs since those were not investigated in this study. Along with including students, future researchers may want to also include counselors and their perceptions. Additional attention could be paid to student recidivism rates. A researcher could compare the number of behavioral referrals before and after the student has served in ISS. With this information, the researcher could determine changes in the students' behavior.

In summary, the results of this study should provide insight for administrators and policymakers that will aid them in resource allocation, hiring personnel, creating policy, and developing and implementing effective ISS programs.

APPENDIX A

ISS SURVEY FOR SCHOOL STAFF

ISS Survey for School Staff

Please answer all the questions by circling the answer that you most agree with.

5= Strongly Agree	4= Agree	3= Disagree	2= Strongly Disagree	1= Not Applicable
-------------------	----------	-------------	----------------------	-------------------

1. In-School suspension (ISS) is an effective method of solving discipline problems.
5 4 3 2 1
2. Students assigned to ISS are less likely to engage in disruptive behavior after their return to the classroom.
5 4 3 2 1
3. ISS is a more effective means of disciplining students than after school detention.
5 4 3 2 1
4. Students placed in ISS receive academic assistance from the ISS director.
5 4 3 2 1
5. Students placed in ISS receive counseling regarding their problems.
5 4 3 2 1
6. The main purpose of ISS should be to punish students.
5 4 3 2 1
7. The main purpose of ISS should be to help students with their academic classwork, especially if they are behind in class.
5 4 3 2 1
8. A certified teacher should be in charge of ISS.
5 4 3 2 1
9. ISS is a waste of the school's time and money.
5 4 3 2 1
10. Teachers who have referred students are informed about improvement in their behavior after placement in ISS.
5 4 3 2 1
11. Students who returned to class after time in ISS display an improved attitude.
5 4 3 2 1
12. The ISS teacher communicates student progress to the regular teacher.
5 4 3 2 1
13. Teachers and ISS staff discusses student assignments before and after placement in the program.
5 4 3 2 1
14. ISS staff is well qualified to conduct the program at your school.
5 4 3 2 1
15. Overall, the ISS program is effective at your school.
5 4 3 2 1

What position do you currently hold in your school?

____ Teacher ____ Administrator ____ ISS Teacher/Director

Personal Information:

1. Your Gender: ____ Male ____ Female

2. Years Experience as an Educator:

____ 1-5	____ 11-15	____ 21-25
____ 6-10	____ 16-20	____ 26 or more

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT PERMISSION LETTER

November 7, 2011

To whom it may concern:

This statement is to offer permission for Mr. Scott Rimes to use my instrument of evaluation in his study on ISS perception.

Dr. David Whitfield

Dr. David Whitfield
11/9/11

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
 - The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
 - The selection of subjects is equitable.
 - Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
 - Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
 - Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
 - Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
 - Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
 - If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
- Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **12032006**

PROJECT TITLE: **Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Student Behavior and Academic Success in Schools**

PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation**

RESEARCHER/S: **John Scott Rimes**

COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education & Psychology**

DEPARTMENT: **Educational Leadership**

FUNDING AGENCY: **N/A**

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: **Expedited Review Approval**

PERIOD OF PROJECT APPROVAL: **03/27/2012 to 03/26/2013**

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

February 1, 2012

Dear:

As a student in the doctoral program at The University of Southern Mississippi, I am engaged in a research project for my dissertation. The study involves conducting a survey of Teachers' and Administrators' Perception of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Students' Behavior and Academic Success. I plan to receive data from respondents located in 18 Mississippi school districts with differing accreditation levels. I will need your permission to use my survey in your school system. The survey will not involve students. It will ask principals, teachers, and ISS Instructors about their perceptions of their school's ISS program and about the services it provides to accommodate the needs of their students and the school. The survey is one page and will only take a few minutes to fill out.

I will address the survey specifically to each personnel member in an envelope that will include a self-addressed stamped return envelope. Their responses will be anonymous. I must receive written permission on your school district letterhead allowing me to survey respondents in your district. The University of Southern Mississippi's Institutional Review Board will approve my project once I get approval from you. Your cooperation in this matter is needed and will enhance this study. I have included a self-addressed stamped envelope for your permission letter.

Please accept my earnest appreciation for your assistance. If you have any questions about the research, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Scott Rimes, Ed.S.
Assistant Principal
Richland High School

APPENDIX E

PERMISSION LETTERS FROM SUPERINTENDENTS

School District

Superintendent

[Redacted]

February 3, 2012

Dear Mr. Scott Rimes:

I have reviewed your request for permission to conduct a survey in the
School District. This letter is to give you permission to survey respondents in
this district for your research project.

If you need further assistance, please feel free to call me at [Redacted]

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
Superintendent [Redacted]

February 14, 2012

Mr. Scott Rimes

~~Dear Mr. Rimes,~~

Thank you for the invitation to participate in the research study in the
' School District of Teachers' and Administrators'
Perception of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Students'
Behavior and Academic Success.

You have my permission to contact principals, teachers and ISS
instructors about their perceptions of their school's ISS program and
the services it provides to accommodate the needs of their students and
the school.

I look forward to receiving a copy of your study and reading the results
of your research.

Sincerely,

, Superintendent
School District

February 6, 2012

Mr. Scott Rimes

Dear Mr. Rimes:

I am in receipt of your letter requesting permission for the principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the School District to participate in the research study for your dissertation on Teachers' and Administrators' Perception of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Students' Behavior and Academic Success. Through this correspondence, I am giving my consent for the protocol you have submitted.

I wish you the best in your efforts.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

February 14, 2012

Dear Mr. Scott Rimes:

I have reviewed your request for permission to conduct a survey in the School District. We understand you will use the protocol submitted and respondents will remain anonymous. This letter is to give you permission to survey respondents in this district for your research project.

If you need further assistance, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

Interim Superintendent

February 7, 2012

Scott Rimes

Dear Mr. Rimes,

I received your request regarding your research for your dissertation and agree that our participation will be mutually beneficial. I will advise my principals of our participation in your study.

I wish you much success in your endeavors. If I can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact me at

Sincerely,

Superintendent of Schools

SUPERINTENDENT

February 28, 2012

Dear Mr. Scott Rimes:

I have reviewed your request for permission to conduct a survey in the _____ County School District. This letter serves as permission to survey respondents in this district for your research project.

If you need further assistance, please feel free to call me at _____

Sincerely,

cc: Principal

February 8, 2012

Mr. Scott Rimes

Dear Mr. Rimes,

Please consider this letter as written permission to conduct your survey, "Teachers and Administrators' Perception of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Students' Behavior and Academic Success," in our district.

I have notified our principals of this survey. Please feel free to contact my office if you need further assistance.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

SCHOOL DISTRICT**Superintendent****Telephone****Telefax**

To: Scott Rimes, Ed.S.

From:

Date: February 9, 2012

RE: Dissertation Project

In response to your dissertation project, you have my permission to conduct your survey of the School District's Teachers' and Administrators' Perception of In-School Suspension Programs on Changing Students' Behavior and Academic Success.

If you need further assistance, please don't hesitate to call.

February 3, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Scott Rimes has requested and received permission to conduct a survey of teachers , principals, and ISS instructors in our district concerning their perceptions of their school's ISS program and the services it provides to accommodate the needs of their students and the school.

Sincerely,

Superintendent
School District

February 3, 2012

Scott Rimes, Ed.S

Dear Mr. Rimes,

The _____ County School District is pleased to assist you in obtaining data to complete your doctoral dissertation: A survey of Teachers' and Administrators' Perception of In-School suspension Programs on Changing Students' Behavior and Academic Success.

You may contact the principals of the schools you have selected to make arrangements to distribute your questionnaire. Please indicate that I have given you permission to contact them.

You may obtain a list of all schools and contact information on our district website:

_____. Please contact _____ in my office _____ if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

REFERENCES

- Adams, A. (2000). The status of school discipline and violence. *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 567, 140-157. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com
- Advantage Press. (2010). *The in school suspension program*. Retrieved from www.advantagepress.com/newsletters/mar01news.asp
- Advocates for Children and Youth. (2006, April). *School suspension: Effects and alternatives executive summary*. (Issue Brief No. 6). Retrieved from www.soros.org/initiatives/baltimore/articles_publications/articles/issue_20060418/issuebrief_20060418.pdf
- Anderson, C. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(3), 368-420. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Anderson, E. A. (2009). *The effectiveness of a proactive school-wide discipline plan on office discipline referrals at the elementary school level* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu>
- Barth, R. (2006). Improving relationships within the schoolhouse. *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 8-13.
- Bartlett, L., & McCullagh, J., (1993). Exclusion from the educational process in the public schools: What process is now due. *Bringham Young University Education & Law Journal*. (1). Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Blomberg, N. (2004). *Effective discipline for misbehavior: In-school vs. out-of-school suspension*. Retrieved from Villanova University Publications. http://www.publications.villanova.edu/Concept/2004/Effective_Discipline.pdf

- Boone, J.M. (2006). *In-school suspension: A qualitative study of high school programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3274166).
- Brown, T. (2007). Lost and turned out: Academic, social, and emotional experiences of students excluded from school. *Urban Education*, 42(5), 432- 455.
- Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 493, (1954).
- Brugman, B. Z. (2004). *Development of a preventative violence-training model for high school employees in the school district of osceola county (Florida)*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.
- Bulach, C. R. (2002). Implementing a character education curriculum and assessing its impact on student behavior. *Clearing House*, 76(2), 79. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Burns, J. (2007). Keys to an effective in-school suspension program. Retrieved from <http://ezinearticles.com/?Keys-To-An-Effective-In-School-Suspension-Program&id=776256>
- Chao, Y. C. (n.d.). Improving classroom behavior and social skills. Retrieved from <https://www.msu.edu/~chaoyu/CEP840.htm>
- Character Education Partnership. (2010). *11 principles of effective character education*. Retrieved from www.character.org/uploads/PDFs/ElevenPrinciples_new2010.pdf
- Chenoweth, T., & Just, H. (2000). *Corporal punishment: Does it hinder the development of children?* Opinion Paper. Retrieved from ERIC database.

- Christle, C., Nelson, M., & Jolivette, K. (2004). School characteristics related to the use of suspension. *Education and the Treatment of Children*, 27(4), 509-526.
Retrieved from www.kysafeschools.org/pdfs/docs/clearpdf/issuesbriefs/EDJJresearch.pdf.
- Chung, G., & Paul, R. (1996). *School-wide discipline policies: In-school suspension in one middle school*. Paper from the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Costenbader, V., & Markson, S. (1994). School suspension: A survey of current policies and practices. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(564), 103-107. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com
- Costenbader, V., & Markson, S. (1998). School suspension: A study with secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36, 59-82. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Cotton, K., & Savard, W. (1982). *Student discipline and motivation: Research synthesis*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ED 224 170).
- Cummings, C. (2009). *Strategies for working with children who challenge the system: In-school suspension as an intervention*. Retrieved from www.pbismaryland.org/SI2009/HCPSSIS_PBIS_09.ppt
- Deal, T. E., & Petersen, K. D. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Delisio, E. R. (2008). In-school suspension: A learning tool. Retrieved from http://www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin/admin329.shtml

- DeRidder, I. M. (1991). How suspension and expulsion contribute to dropping out. *Education Digest*, 56(6), 153-157. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Di Lullo, L. (2004). Appropriate conduct. *Principal Leadership*, 4, 27-29. Retrieved from www.nassp.org/portals/0/content/48974.pdf
- Duke, D. L. (1989). School organization, leadership, and student behavior. *Strategies to reduce student misbehavior*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. ED 311 608.
- Ediger, M. (2002). *Reading and quality discipline in the classroom*. Opinion Paper from Truman State University, North Newton, KS. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Embry, D. (1997). Does your school have a peaceful environment? *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 32(4), 217. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Farrell, C. (2010). *Corporal punishment in U.S. schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.corpun.com/counuss.htm>
- First, J., & Mizell, H. (1980). *Everybody's business: A book about school discipline*. Columbia, SC: Southeastern Public Education Program.
- Flanagain, W. C. (2007). *The negative aspects of in and out of school suspensions and alternatives that promote academic achievement*. Survey Report from Maygrove College. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gaustad, J. (1992). *School Discipline*. ERIC Digest, Number 78. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved from eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest078.html

- Gibbs, J., Giever, D., & Martin, J. S. (1998). Parental management and self control: An empirical test of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35(1), 40-70. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Garibaldi, A. M. (1979), In-school alternatives to suspension. *The Urban Review*, 11(2), 97-102.
- Gootman, M. (1998) Effective in-house suspension. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 39-41. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Goss v. Lopez*, 419U.S.565 955 Ct.729 (1975).
- Guindon, J. (1992). *Developing an in-school suspension program in an elementary school as an alternative to homebound suspension*. (Doctoral dissertation, Nova University). Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Gushee, M. (1984). *Student discipline policies*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Hachiya, R. F. (2010). *Balancing student rights and the need for safe schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (AAT 3409512).
- Haley, A. N., & Watson D. C. (2000). In-school literacy extension: Beyond in-school suspension. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, 654-661. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Hanson, D., Burton, D., & Quam, G. (2006). Six concepts to help you align with NCLB. *Technology Teacher*. 17-20. Retrieved from <http://www.ezproxy.mc.edu>
- Harvey, D., & Moosha, W. (1977). In-school suspension: Does it work? *NASSP Bulletin*, 61(405), 14-17. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com

- Hochman, S. R., & Worner, W. (1987). In-school suspension and group counseling: Helping the at-risk student. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(501), 93-97. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com
- Hrabak, M., & Settles, D. (2007). Effective in-school suspension programs. *Kentucky Center for School Safety*. Retrieved from www.kysafeschools.org/pdfs&docs/clearpdf/issuesbriefs/
- Huang, S. (1995). *Comparing school based environment of high and low performing inner city schools*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Hurley, S. (2002). Balancing school safety and student constitutional rights: A legal memorandum. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*. Retrieved from www.nassp.org/portals/0/content/50120.pdf
- Hyman, I. (1995). Corporal punishment, psychological maltreatment, violence, and punitiveness in America: Research, advocacy, and public policy. *Applied and Preventative Psychology*, 4, 113-130.
- Hymowitz, K. S. (2000). What's wrong with the kids? *City Journal*, 10(1), 2-4. Retrieved from http://www.city-journal.org/html/10_1_whats_wrong.html
- Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651 (Supreme Court of the United States, April 19, 1977).
- Iselin, A. (2010). *Research on suspension and alternatives to suspension*. Paper presented at the Legislative Auditorium, Raleigh, NC., April 27, 2010. Retrieved from www.childandfamilypolicy.duke.edu/pdfs/pdfs/familyimpact/2010/Suspension_Research_Brief_2010-04-27.pdf

- La Morte, M. W. (2008). *School Law: Cases and Concepts* (Vol. 9). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Landau, B., & Gathercoal, P. (2000). Creating peaceful classrooms: Judicious discipline and classmeetings. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 450-455.
- Lee, N. (2007). *Perceptions of ISS in modifying behaviors*. Paper from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, TN.
- Lock, R. W. (1991). Classroom discipline problems can be prevented. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 38(1), 5-7.
- Logsdon, A. (2011). *In-school suspension — does in-school suspension trigger protections of IDEA?*. Retrieved from <http://learningdisabilities.about.com/od/disabilitylaws/qt/schoolsuspensio.htm>
- MacNeil, A., & Prater, D. (2000). The differing views of teachers and principals on the seriousness of school discipline. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 14(1), 14-22. Retrieved from www.nationalforum.com
- Mansfield, W., Alexander, D., & Farris, E. (1991). *Teacher survey on safe disciplined and drug free schools*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/frss/publications/91091/index.asp>
- Marzano, R. (2000). *Transforming classroom grading*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Melton, D. H. (2001). *In-school suspension programs in Mississippi high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 3030269).
- Mendez, R. (1977). School suspension-discipline without failure. *NASSP Bulletin*, 61(405), 11-13. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com
- Mendez, R., & Sanders, S. G. (1981). An examination of in-school suspension: Panacea or pandora's box. *NASSP Bulletin*, 65(441), 65-69.
- Metzger, D. (2004). Rethinking classroom management: Teaching and learning with students. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 17(2), 13-15. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4033/is_200110/ai_n8982813/
- Miners, Z., & Scarpa, S. (2007). New law limits out-of-school suspensions. *District Administration*, 43(11), 20-22. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2011). *Mississippi Department of Education announces 2011 Performance Labels with more Star Districts and Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/Extrel/news/2011/11PerformanceLabels.html>
- Mississippi Youth Justice Project. (2010). *Effective discipline for student success: Reducing student and teacher dropout rates in Mississippi*. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/images/dynamic/main/effective_discipline.pdf
- Mizell, M. H. (1978). Designing and implementing effective in-school alternatives to suspension. *The Urban Review*, 10(3), 213-226.

- Moorefield, L. (2005, August-September). Reflective discipline: Providing students a tool for self-reflection can decrease classroom disruptions and help identify the problems behind them. *Teaching K-8*, 70-71.
- Morgan, H. (1991). *Race and gender issues: In school suspensions*. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL, April 1991) Springfield, VA. Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC), U.S. Department of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED351416).
- Morris, R., & Howard, A. (2003). Designing an effective in-school suspension program. *The Clearing House*, 76(3), 156-159. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Morrison, G. M., & D'Incau, B. (2000). Developmental and service trajectories of students with disabilities recommended for expulsion from school. *Exceptional Children*, 66(2), 257-272. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb3130/is_2_66/ai_n28760379/
- Morrison, G. M., Anthony, S., Storino, M., & Dillon, C. (2001). An examination of the disciplinary histories and the individual and educational characteristics of students who participate in an in-school suspension program. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 24(3), 276. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from www.nces.ed.gov
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Characteristics of public schools*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from www.nces.ed.gov

Nichols, J. D. (1999). *An exploration of discipline and suspension data*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Nichols, J. D. (2004). An exploration of discipline and suspension data. *Journal of Negro Education*, 73(4), 408-423. Retrieved from

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3626/is_200410/ai_n13506843/pg_5/

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, H.R. 110, 107th Cong. (2001).

Noddings, N. (2005). What does it mean to educate the whole child? *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 8-13. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Noguera, P. A. (1995). Preventing and producing violence: A critical analysis of responses to school violence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(2), 189-212.

Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Opuni, K., Tullis, R., Sanchez, K., & Gonzalez, J. (1991). *Student assignment centers: An in-school suspension program*. Report prepared for Houston Independent School District, Texas Department of Research and Evaluation. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Owen, S. (2005). The relationship between social capital and corporal punishment in schools: A theoretical inquiry. *Youth & Society*, 37, 85-112. Retrieved from

EBSCOhost.

Papesh, S. (2001). Choosing classroom battles wisely. *Education Digest*, 66(5), 29-32.

Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Patterson, F. (1985). In-school suspension rehabilitates offenders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 69(493), 97-99.

- Peterson, R. (2005). Ten alternatives to suspension. *Impact*, 18(2), 10-11. Retrieved from <http://ici.umn.edu/products/impact/182/default.html>
- Peterson, R. (2009). *What every administrator needs to know about alternatives to suspension and expulsion*. Opinion Paper: The University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved from www.mslbd.org/Admin_Conference/Peterson%2010-6-06.pdf
- Portner, J. (1998). Discipline problems linked to low scores, study says. *Education Week*, 18(8), 6-8. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Putnam, R. F., Horner, R. H., & Algozzine, R. (2006). Academic achievement and the implementation of school-wide behavior support. *Positive Behavioral Supports Newsletter*, 3(1). Retrieved from www.pbis.org/news/New/Newsletters/Newsletter1.asp
- Raebeck, B. (1993). Beyond the dunce cap. *The Executive Educator*, 15(4), 26-28. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Ramsey, R. D. (1994). *Administrator's complete school discipline guide: Techniques & materials for creating an environment where kids can learn*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Richardson, C. L. (2009). *Planning for an in school suspension program: An action research study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (UMI: 3352615).
- Ripple Effects. (2011). *Using ripple effects in ISS and detention settings*. Retrieved from <http://rippleeffects.com/context/suspension.htm>

Robers, S., Zhang, J., & Truman, J. (2010). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2010*.

Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2010/ind_05.asp

Sacharow, F. (2010, November). Time to rethink school suspension? *Rutgers Today*.

Retrieved from <http://news.rutgers.edu/focus/issue.2010-11-01.4539130324/article.2010-11-08.7147635201>

Sheets, J. (1996). Designing an effective in-school suspension program to change student behavior, *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(579), 86-90. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com

Short, P. M. (1988). *Planning and developing in-school suspension programs*. (ERIC Document Service No. ED303875).

Siegel, L., & Senna, J. (1994). *Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice and law*. (5th ed.). St. Paul; MN: West.

Silvey, D. F. (1995). *The effects of in-school suspension on the academic progress of high school science and English students*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED389069).

Sisco, D. (2010). Time-out and in-school suspension in the school setting: a user's guide for school administrators. Opinion Paper. Retrieved from www.mslbd.org/Admin_Conference/Sisco%2010-5-06.pdf

Siskind, T., Leonard, G., Carnucci, M., Gibson, M., Jeng, J., Nevarre, A., et al. (1993). *An evaluation of in-school suspension programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL. Retrieved from ERIC.

- Skiba, R., Peterson, R., & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspension: Disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 20(3), 295-316. Retrieved from http://www.neiu.edu/~sasevesk/office_referrals_and_suspension.pdf
- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: can punishment lead to safe schools?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(5), 372-376, 381-382. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (2003). Teaching the social curriculum: School discipline as instruction. *Preventing School Failure*, 47, 66-72. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Skiba, R., & Sprague, J. (2008). Safety without suspensions. *Educational Leadership*, 66(1), 38-43. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (1997). *Juvenile offenders and victims: A force on violence*. Washington, D.C.: Dept of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/action/intro.htm>
- Society for Adolescent Medicine. (2003). Corporal punishment in schools: Position paper of the Society for Adolescent Medicine. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32, 385-393. Retrieved from www.adolescenthealth.org
- Southard, M. (2002). *In-school suspension*. Retrieved from <http://www.tandl.leon.k12.fl.us/programme/Suspensions.html>
- Spitalli, S. J. (2005). The DON'TS of student discipline. *Education Digest*, 70(5), 28-31. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

- Spivak, H. (1999). *The role of the pediatrician in youth violence prevention in clinical practice and at the community level*. American Academy of Pediatrics, 103(1), 173-181. Retrieved from <http://aappolicy.aappublications.org/cgi/reprint/pediatrics;103/1/173.pdf>
- Sroufe, A., Duggal, S., Weinfeld, N., & Carlson, E. (2000). Relationships, development and psychopathology. In A. Sameroff, M. Lewis, & S. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental psychopathology*, 2, 75-92. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Stage, S. A. (1997). A preliminary investigation of the relationship between in-school suspension and the disruptive classroom behavior of students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 23(1), 57-76. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Stiefer, J. (2003). *Voices unheard: An interpretive study of in school suspension* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (AAT: 3082946).
- Storm, A. (1998). Reducing out-of-school suspensions through alternative placements. *The School Administrator*, (55). Retrieved from archives.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm
- Strahan, D., Cope, M., Hundley, S., & Faircloth, C. (2005). Positive discipline with students who need it most. *Clearing House*, 79(1), 25-30. Retrieved from ERIC Database.
- Sullivan, J. (1989). Elements of a successful in-school suspension program. *NASSP Bulletin* 73(516), 32-38. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com

- Susswein, R. (2000). The New Jersey school search policy manual: Striking the balance of students' rights of privacy and security after the columbine tragedy. *The New England Law Review*, (34)3, 527-564. Retrieved from heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/newlr34&div=35&id=&page=
- Tableman, B. (2004). *School climate and learning*. (Best Practices Brief No. 31). Retrieved from <http://outreach.msu.edu/bpbriefts/issues/brief31.pdf>
- Taras, H. L. (2003). *Out of school suspension and promotion*. American Academy of Pediatrics, 112(5), 1206-1209. Retrieved from <http://aappolicy.aappublications.org/cgi/reprint/pediatrics;112/5/1206.pdf>
- Teicher, S. (2005). To paddle or not to paddle? It's still not clear in U.S. schools. *Christian Science Monitor*, 97(78). Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0317/p01s04-legn.html>
- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District*, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).
- Tobin, T., & Sugai, G. (1999). Predicting violence at school, chronic discipline problems, and high school outcomes from sixth graders' school records. *Journal of Emotional Disorders*, 7, 40-53.
- Turner, T. E. (1998). *Perceptions of in-school suspension by never suspended students, suspended students, and teachers and their relationship to the effectiveness of in-school suspension programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

- U.S. cited as world's most violent industrial nation -- pervasive fear is a part of life, researchers say. (1992, November 13). *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://community.seattletimes.nwsources.com/archive/?date=19921113&slug=1524333>
- Vanderslice, R. (1999). *Developing effective in-school suspension programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Women in Educational Leadership, Bicton, Western Australia. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Vavrus, E., & Cole, K. (2002). "I didn't do nothin'": The discursive construction of school suspension. *The Urban Review*, 34, 87-111.
- Volokh, A., & Snell, L. (1998). *School violence prevention: Strategies to keep schools safe*. (Policy Study No. 234). Retrieved from <http://www.reason.org/ps234.html>
- Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2004). *Antisocial behavior in school*. Belmont, CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Wallace, J. M., Jr., Goodkind, S. G., Wallace, C. M., & Bachman, J. (2008). Racial/ethnic and gender differences in school discipline among American high school students: 1991–2005. *Negro Educational Review*, 59, 47–62. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2678799/>
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Weisz, E. (1994). Poor discipline: Who's to blame? *Kappa Delta Phi Record*, 30(4), 164-165.

- Welch, M. E. (2010). *Differences in Student Misbehavior After Completing In-School Suspension Between Rural High School and Suburban High School* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 3416318).
- Wheelock, A. (1986). *The way out: Student exclusion practices in Boston middle schools*. Massachusetts Advocacy Center. Retrieved from <http://middleweb.com/INCASEiss.html>
- Whitfield, D., & Bulach, C. (1996). *A study of the effectiveness of an in-school suspension*. Paper presented at the National Dropout prevention Network Conference, Tampa, FL. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Wilson, D. (2004). The interface of school climate and school connectedness and relationships with aggression and victimization. *The Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 293-299. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Winborne, C. R. (1980). In-school suspension programs: The King William County model. *Educational Leadership*, 37(6), 466. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Yell, M. L., Drasgow, E., & Rozalski, M. E. (2001). Disciplining students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 33(9), 1. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.